

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1877.

ART. I.—RUSSIA.

Russia. By D. MACKENZIE WALLACE, M.A., Member of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society. Second Edition. Cassell, Petter, & Galpin, London, Paris, and New York, 1877.

THERE are dark places on our earth which lie for generations in almost impenetrable shadow, partly on account of their local and geographical conditions, and partly because the policy which shapes their history seeks to veil them from the eyes of the stranger. At length the day arrives when the curtain is drawn aside, and a flood of unwelcome light reveals secrets which no precautions can any longer hide from general observation. In our own day this has happened to China and Japan. After centuries of obstinate and premeditated isolation, upon which the only successful intruders were the valiant missionaries of the Cross, these Asiatic kingdoms have been compelled to take their place, more or less clearly defined, in the family of nations. The same fate has overtaken the vast semi-barbarous nation, which its rulers long hid from the scrutiny of Europe, because they understood that it presented a dismal contrast to Western civilisation, and that the fabric of savage absolutism erected in it, after the model of its Tartar and Mongolian eras, could only be perpetuated by prolonging the barbarism and maintaining the ignorance which were essential conditions of its continuance. Peter I. used to speak of his subjects as "my savages," and Catherine II. told Repnin, the governor of Moscow, "The day that our peasants learn to read, neither you nor I will keep our places." That astute princess, who was a frightful compound of vice and unbelief, comprehended that the least movement of thought, and the slightest tincture of education, would be inevitably fatal to the dark imposture of "tsarodoxy." The pretence of establishing schools, she admitted, was only to throw dust in the eyes of Europe. The "hereditary fraud" which Gregory XVI. imputed to Russian despots, and which Russian writers of our day confess

to be the distinctive feature of all Russian policy, is practised as systematically as ever, but no longer with the same success. The veil has been torn away from China and Japan, and Russia in her turn stands unmasked before the gaze of Europe.

We have a profound conviction, based upon the concurring testimony of a host of capable witnesses, that Russian religion and policy, which those witnesses will presently describe to us, contribute far more to the degradation of the human species, the suppression of Christian liberty, and the sustenance of barbarism—in spite of certain promising qualities and the excellent dispositions of the docile Russian people—than Catholics commonly dream. In one respect, this religion and policy contrast unfavourably with any other combination of evil principles which conspires in our day against the dignity of man and the welfare of modern society. Other ruinous agencies candidly avow their aim, and make no secret of the means by which they propose to attain it. It is the union of unblushing hypocrisy with the adulteration of religion and the decay of virtue, which distinguishes Russian artifice and duplicity from the frank and undisguised wickedness of more candid enemies of the human race. The power which maintains itself by remorseless tyranny at home affects to be the champion of liberty abroad, and to be solicitous for the dignity of a religion in other lands which it has degraded into an instrument of national policy in its own, deprived of all spiritual savour, and reduced to the mechanical observance of purely external rites.* It is this prostitution of religion which has brought so many of the upper classes, as Tourgeneff, Gerebtzoff,† and other Russian writers observe, to total unbelief, and created that almost universal immorality among the lower which Mr. Ralston ascribes “to the acute despair which goads its victims into deadly crime.”‡ There are nations, like Prussia and Switzerland, which legislate for the suppression of spiritual life, and even subvert their own constitution in order to annihilate religion; but the worst felonies of Russia against God and man are all committed *in the name of religion*. If she disturbs the peace of Europe by her egotistic projects, of which lust of domination is the sole motive, it is done under the impudent pretext of a “holy

* “The Russians,” M. de Bonald observes, “have a religion entirely composed of words, ceremonies, legends, and abstinences, which is to genuine Christianity nearly what the Judaism of the Rabbis, followed by modern Jews, is to the Mosaic worship.”—“*Législation Primitive*,” t. iv. p. 176.

† “*Histoire de la Civilisation en Russie*,” t. ii. p. 519.

‡ “*Early Russian History*,” p. 229.

mission." After killing religion at home, and deliberately violating the fundamental precepts of the Christian code in the government of her own subjects, she invites the Cabinets of Europe to resign to her the task of redressing the wrongs, real or supposed, of other lands. The suggestion, though supported in England by a certain school of politicians, is rejected with righteous disdain by a public opinion enlightened by disclosures of which the authenticity is recognised more clearly every day as incontestable. It has only succeeded in fixing attention upon the real character of the nation from which it proceeds, and upon the evidences which are now multiplying on every side of its too triumphant warfare against the law of God, the rights of man, the claims of liberty, and the possibility of civilisation. Penetrated of late years in every direction by intelligent observers, of all creeds and nationalities, who have found access to official sources of information, and interrogated every class of its population, its secrets are now divulged from the housetops in a dozen languages, and communicated to a discriminating and sarcastic criticism in the popular literature of every country in Europe. Russian voices have swelled the chorus, but only to confirm the worst impressions derived from German, English, and French writers. In spite of a censure of public documents unmatched in severity, the opinions of eminent Russians have obtained publicity, and though, as Prince Kozlowski observes, "every discourse in this country is the expression either of religious or political hypocrisy,"* and, as Prince Dolgoroukow laments, "Russia is the land of official and organized mendacity,"† Prince Gagarin indicates a reliable source of instruction when he says, "You must not read what is printed, but listen to what is said."‡ In one of his works he gives us the means of doing so. Few modern Russians were better qualified, either by natural gifts or acquired knowledge, to estimate their own country in comparison with others than Tchadaief, who was an officer of the Imperial Guard before he gave himself up to the study of nobler institutions and more advanced races. Though he died in the so-called Orthodox Church, he evidently understood that it was the guardian of a depraved Christianity. "No doubt we are Christians," he said, "but so are the Abyssinians." Nor did he doubt that the real source of the stunted growth of the Russian religion was its connection

* "Tendances Catholiques dans la Société Russe," par le Prince J. Gagarin, S.J., p. 35.

† "La Vérité sur la Russie," par le Prince Pierre Dolgoroukow, p. 9.

‡ Ubi supra, p. 1.

with the Photian schism. "We went to the miserable Byzantium," he observes, "to look for the moral code which was to form our education;" and he adds, with intelligent candour, that, as "the vivifying principle of unity" was wanting both to Constantinople and Moscow, they have dwelt ever since in a common spiritual stagnation. "We have never marched with the other peoples," he continues; "we belong to none of the great families of the human race; we are neither of the West nor the East, and have no part in the traditions of the one or the other. Placed as it were outside the course of time, the universal education of the human race has not reached to us. At first a brutal barbarism, and then a senseless superstition, that was the sorrowful history of our youth. We have I know not what in the blood which bids defiance to all true progress. We are only a gap in the order of intellectual being."* It is a characteristic incident in the policy of Russian Tsars, that when the late Emperor Nicholas became aware of the sentiments avowed by Tchadaief, he ordered him, with an Asiatic refinement of cruelty, to be confined in a lunatic asylum. He was quite willing that Russia should be degraded and brutalised, but not willing that any Russian should admit it.

If in Russia torture and death are the penalty of impeaching Tsarodoxy, in freer nations it is permitted to discuss its true character without the loss of liberty or life. In a debate in the House of Commons on the Eastern Question, on the 16th of February, Mr. Whitworth claimed to speak "from the experience of residence in the East and from practical observation." The conclusions to which they brought him were thus expressed:—"If it came to a question who should occupy Constantinople, he should unhesitatingly say the Turk. He knew there was as much cruelty practised in Russia as in Turkey. He had mentioned to individuals facts relating to Russia—they could not be stated to the House—which were as repulsive and atrocious as were ever committed by the Turks. Therefore, if any one were to say, 'Fight for Constantinople,' he would fight. No greater misfortune could happen to Europe than the extension of Russia to Constantinople." Sir Edward Sullivan, noticing the wild harangues of Mr. Gladstone, said: "To style the Turks 'the one anti-human specimen of humanity' is a gross perversion of fact; in every sense their rule is more humane, more beneficent, more progressive, than is that of Russia. The 'atrocities' were commenced by the Christians, *acting under*

* Ibid., pp. 11, 17, 19.

Russian instigation, roasting alive Turkish officials, and burning villages and slaying their inhabitants."* A multitude of writers, acquainted by actual observation with both races, dispute Mr. Gladstone's estimate of the relative moral superiority of Russians and Turks with equal emphasis. Mr. Ralston, a well-informed student of Russian history, in a recent essay on "Turkish Story-books," writes as follows:—"All who know the Turkish common people intimately speak well of them. Sober, honest, and industrious, the Turk, so long as he is poor and lowly, is a respectable member of society, with numerous good points in his character." After adding that he becomes corrupt only when raised to official position, he continues—"Fortunately for the prospects of Turkey, the tolerably good common people are many, the intolerably bad magnates are few in number."† It is moreover a sorrowful truth that the contempt which Turks display for Christians is largely justified by the specimens under their own observation. The almost unexampled degradation of the Photian patriarchate of Constantinople, which, as Dr. Dollinger says, "is in the most shameful condition to which an ancient and venerable Church has ever yet been reduced,"‡ has not promoted Turkish veneration for the religion of Christians. In Greece itself, Sir Thomas Wyse reports, "half of the clergy only can read and write, have all the vices of the lowest of the people, and often many more;"§ while another English writer quotes the saying of a modern Greek: "Every educated Hellene is an atheist; for our religion has one great advantage—it leads to atheism sooner than any other."|| What the professors of Islam see of Russian religion, and the characters which it forms, tends quite as little to augment their respect for a form of Christianity which seems to them chiefly fruitful in vice, oppression, and contempt for the laws of God and man. That impression they share with Georgians, Armenians, and other races, including the Circassians, upon all of whom, as Bodenstedt observes, "it is incredible how ruinous and demoralizing

* Quoted in "Diplomatic Review," October, 1876, p. 277. The same Review cites, p. 280, the protest of Mr. Bertie, an Anglican vicar, who discreetly observes: "I cannot see the wisdom of removing one despotism to substitute another far more dangerous to the liberties of Europe."

† See the "Nineteenth Century," March, 1877, p. 23.

‡ "The Church and the Churches," p. 138. He adds that it "has now been for hundreds of years connected with an unexampled system of extortion, corruption, and simony"—a statement confirmed by Ranke, "History of Servia," ch. ii., p. 30, and by Krasinski, "Montenegro," p. 143.

§ "Impressions of Greece," ch. v. p. 121; ch. xii. p. 237.

|| "A Residence in Bulgaria," by Captain St. Clair, ch. vii. p. 98.

Russian influence is. The only things Russians bring with them into conquered lands are new coercive measures, new forms of deceit, of falsehood, and of abuse of the Church for objects of police."* How Russia came to be what she is can only be understood by a glance at her past history, which reveals a long and persistent conspiracy against the dignity of religion and the life of liberty.

The earlier annals of the country which is now called Russia, and from which in the fourth and fifth centuries went forth the savage hordes who destroyed Christian civilisation, and most of whom are quite prepared to do it again, are a monotonous record of conflicts between various tribes, all equally barbarous and ferocious. The final issue of a thousand combats gave the victory to the Muscovites. To consolidate the newly-founded kingdom, and devise a policy which should cement its precarious unity, was a task to which the genius and energy of Peter I. were not unequal. An intemperate savage, whose life was stained with colossal crimes, and for whom religion was only a political instrument, he inaugurated that system of fraud and violence, and of the concentration of the spiritual authority in the hands of the temporal prince, which his successors have perpetuated, and which constitutes that "vast pyramid of oppression" under which, as Prince Dolgorowkow remarks, Russia impotently groans. Everything in that system which is not tyranny is fiction and duplicity. Even the pretence of the reigning house to descend from the original Muscovite princes, which the late Emperor Nicholas forbade his subjects to discuss, is a mere imposture. For seven centuries the sceptre was held by the descendants of Rurik, but it passed into the hands of the usurper Boris Godunof, who was the representative of a Tartar noble. The first Romanoff only dates from 1613, and the founder of the family, according to Kostomarof, was an emigrant from Prussia.† The male line became extinct in 1730,‡ though Nicholas would not suffer any Russian to allude to the fact. It must be admitted, however, that, if later Russian princes have based their whole administration on false pretexts and transparent untruths, the founder of modern Russia made no secret of the policy upon which he acted, and to which his nation owes its permanent isolation from Christian unity and civilization. Without religion

* "Life in the Caucasus and the East," vol. i. p. 57. Mr. Edward Spencer says the same thing in "Travels in the Western Caucasus," vol. i. ch. viii. p. 103.

† Ralston, "Early History of Russia," pp. 156, 175.

‡ Dolgorowkow, p. 317.

himself, his genius conceived the scheme of a purely *national* religion, which should form an impassable barrier between Muscovites and all non-Sclavonic races, facilitate the extension of Russian influence among the latter in every province where they were found, and constitute at the same time a bond of union for his own newly-formed empire, and an efficacious means of extending its limits. This prostitution of religion to the promotion of purely secular designs has been from that day to this the essential principle of Russian policy. It took as little account of the Photian sects as of the Catholic Church. The nominal head of the former was the schismatical Bishop of Constantinople, whose spurious authority Peter and his successors have treated with ostentatious contempt, and persuaded the Greek, Bulgarian, and other communities to do likewise. The Byzantine was to be replaced and overshadowed by the Muscovite pontiff. With this object, Peter's first act was to suppress the patriarchate of Moscow, in order to weaken the ties and destroy the relations with Constantinople, and to substitute for it the so-called "Holy Synod," which became a department of the State, under the sole and supreme control of the Tsar. That revolutionary project he rightly deemed himself strong enough to execute in the face of all opposition. If religion was to work out his policy, it must be a religion in his own hands, and employed for the furtherance of his own designs. What they were he frankly avowed. To promote the glory of God or the salvation of souls was no part of his ambition. Nothing concerned him less. His purpose was to make, not Christians, but Russians. "We must gather around Russia," he said, "all the Greeks scattered by discords, who are spread in Hungary, in Turkey, and in the south of Poland; make ourselves their centre, their support; and thus found by anticipation, and by a sort of sacerdotal supremacy, a universal hegemony."* When the Bishop of Novgorod solicited the restoration of the Russian Patriarchate, he only provoked his own ruin. "I recognise," replied Peter, "no other legitimate Patriarch but the Bishop of Rome. Since you will not obey him, you shall obey me alone. Behold your Patriarch!"† Consistently with this view of the pontifical character of the Russian Tsars, every member of the Holy Synod swears on his admission to that body: "I confess upon oath that the Monarch of All Russia himself is the Supreme Judge of this

* Leonard Choderko, quoted by Colonel Chesney, "The Russo-Turkish Campaign," Appx., p. 462.

† Theiner, "L'Eglise Schismatique Russe," p. 46.

Spiritual College.”* Catherine II. told her clergy in 1762 : “Our predecessors, like all monarchs, were invested by God with the supreme authority in the Church.” And this view of the constitution of the Church was accepted by the Russian clergy with the same abject docility as by the Anglican bishops in the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth, and James I. Miliutin testifies that the Russian bishops were in favour of “the concentration of all the scattered principalities under the power of a single Tsar,” because they conceived it would be “*advantageous for them.*”† The system thus established has never changed its character. The only difference between Peter and some of his successors is that which Prince Dolgorowkow attributes to Nicholas, of whom he says : “Nicholas did not *profess* to be the head of the Church, but *acted* as if he was.”‡ Unlike Peter and Catherine, he so far respected the prejudices of Europe as to admit that, at least in theory, the true Head of the Church is Jesus Christ ; but his spiritual vassals profited so little by the verbal concession, that his whole career, as the same fervent and patriotic Russian adds, “was a war of thirty years against civilization and common sense, and founded on profound contempt for humanity and the deification of his own personality.”§

The clue to modern Russian history, and to the whole course of Russian policy, is found, then, in the sacrilegious degradation of religion as an instrument of temporal government and a bond of civil union. Even the horrible persecution of the Catholics of Poland, unmatched in ferocity since pagan times, and continued under the present Tsar with the same unshrinking pertinacity as under his father, though intensified by the malice which all professors of national religions feel towards the Universal Church, is primarily a *political* measure, of which the purpose is to fuse in one mould, and reduce to one type, all varieties of character and all forms of life, in subjection to the same ruling idea, the same dominant and inflexible system. Every Russian is bound to profess “orthodoxy,” while repudiating the source whence it originally proceeded, not as a means of promoting sanctity and union with God, but because it is the religion of the Tsar, who has made himself its supreme pontiff, and the identification of each individual with the general aims and projects of Russian policy. “Measures of severity will never be relaxed,” said General Kaufmann and other agents of his

* Tondini, “The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Orthodox Church,” pp. 42, 77, 103.

† Quoted by Ralston, p. 126.

‡ “La Vérité sur la Russie,” p. 341.

§ Ibid., p. 33.

class to the Polish and Lithuanian Catholics, "till you become good Russians,"—i.e., till you consent to embrace orthodoxy, whether you believe it or not. Many of its most unscrupulous champions have been men, like the savage Mouravieff, who were notorious atheists. Hence the popular proverb which makes orthodoxy the equivalent of "tsarodoxy." Recent works on Russia, and notably the invaluable volumes of Pere Lescœur,* abound with illustrations of the deliberate impiety with which involuntary adhesions to the official Church are secured. All pretence of a spiritual motive is disavowed by the very agents who are employed to recruit the ranks of orthodoxy. They candidly proclaim that their sole purpose is to enforce "the will of the Emperor." No profession of faith is required from the unhappy victims, whose forced "conversion" is simply a tribute to the national policy, and whether they believe anything or nothing is not even a subject of inquiry. A few examples will make this clear.

We begin with the case of the Catholic inhabitants of Dziernowice, which occurred during the reign of the present Emperor. After being driven by troops and police into a schismatical church, where, in spite of all the resistance which their despair could oppose to the sacrilege, "*the Host was forced into their mouths*,"† they were told that they had now become members of the Orthodox Church. As their horror for a religion which could seek to propagate itself by such means was only augmented, they not only continued to practise their own faith in secret, but presented a petition to the Tsar soliciting leave to profess it openly. It was impossible to repudiate more emphatically all complicity with the State religion; but as, in the judgment of the Russian authorities, that was not of the least importance, and they were only required to *profess* Orthodoxy, without the superfluous addition of believing it, they were told that their petition could not even be "taken into consideration." And this was not all. A colonel of police, Losiew, was despatched with a body of troops, whom he quartered on the inhabitants; and by this person they were thus addressed in the name of the Emperor. In no other country but Russia could the scene which we are about to relate have occurred.

"It is the will of the Emperor, our gracious Sovereign," said Losiew to the assembled people, "that you should all become orthodox. Why do you resist? Why do you refuse to become converted?"

* "L'Eglise Catholique en Pologne," 1876.

† Lescœur, t. i. p. 317.

"We are all faithful subjects of the Emperor," they answered; "we pay our taxes, we furnish recruits to the army, in case of need we do not refuse to shed our blood, but we will never abandon the faith of our fathers."

"You are rebels, then, for *you resist the will of the Emperor*. Who are they who persuade you to revolt? Give me the names of your leaders, and thus some of you will remain free; otherwise, you will all receive the *knout* and be sent to Siberia, and will never again see your wives or children."

"We are all leaders," was the noble reply, "for we are all Catholics. We are ready to accept Siberia and death itself, but we will never abjure our faith."

"But you have already been to church, and have embraced the Orthodox faith. You are now, therefore, apostates."

"Do not be angry, Sir, at what we are going to say. You yourself, if two companies of soldiers had driven you with bayonets in your back, would you not have been forced to enter even the sty of a pig? What is there surprising, then, if we were driven in the same way into a church? Those who resisted, clinging to the hinges or the doors of the church, did they not cut off their fingers with sabres and hatchets? Many of these victims may still be found among us."

To this the Colonel of police found no answer; but if he was silenced, the troop of Russian priests who accompanied him were not. "Many of you," they shouted, "received Holy Communion, and now you appear to mock our belief."

"We do not mock you, but how did they administer the Communion to us? They struck us on the jaw, and forced the point of a sword between our teeth. And, moreover, we were not fasting, nor had we been to confession.*

The narrative, which we here interrupt, supplies further evidence both of the intelligence and the Christian fortitude of the Catholics, and also of the incredible ignorance, brutality, and superstition of the Russian clergy. In their impious profanation of the Holy Sacrament, they manifested their own indifference to the majesty of that sacred mystery, and pronounced judgment on themselves. But we are not writing a history of Russian persecutions, and will only add, as a further revelation of the spirit which animates and controls them, a few words from the address to the same people of the Senator Stcherbinin, who was despatched a little later from St. Petersburg to crown the unfinished work of Colonel Losiew. He was probably selected for his skill as an orator, which he displayed in the following harangue:—"The Em-

* T. i. p. 321.

peror Alexander II., in ascending the throne of all the Russias, has sworn to protect the Orthodox faith. Consequently, the obligations of his oath do not permit him to allow you to remain Catholics. It ought to be known to you that the will of the Emperor is sacred, and that he is the messenger of God. God is in heaven, the Emperor on earth; whoever disobeys the Emperor disobeys God. Far be it from you, then, to oppose his will. The Emperor wills, and God also wills, that you should be orthodox. Well, do you submit to his will?"* It is this identification of the will of God with that of the Tsar which is the essential article of the Orthodox creed. It seems to us also a fearful example of the loss of spiritual liberty which has everywhere been the chastisement of revolt against the Holy See. That is not the only lesson which "tsarodoxy" proclaims, but it is the one which seems to have most claim to the attention of our own countrymen, some of whom begin to perceive that the substitution of secular tribunals for the Chair of Peter is as fatal to freedom as it is to unity, though hitherto they are rather occupied with the *fact* than with the conclusions to which it points. It is certain that Catholic England, clergy and people alike, attributed its liberties to the influence and protection of the Holy See. When Englishmen once more give devout and glad obedience to that sacred authority, so dear and precious to their fathers, they will recover all that they have lost.

Our main purpose in these pages is to review the latest work on Russia, in order to show, by evidence which is confirmed from a hundred other sources, what has been the practical result of Russian national policy, and of the autocratic will which inspires it, upon the moral and religious condition of the empire. But we must be permitted to call attention first, in a few words, to two impressive facts: (1), that the unrelenting persecution of Catholics is a violation both of treaties and of the reiterated pledges of Russian autocrats; and (2), that it is a formal renunciation of the doctrines still enshrined in the liturgical books of the Russian Church. When the second partition of Poland took place, by a violation of justice which has since become habitual in the annals of many European kingdoms, it was stipulated by the eighth article of the treaty of Grodno, which bore the signature of the Empress Catherine, that she, "her heirs and successors, would irrevocably maintain in perpetuity the Roman Catholics of both rites in the undisturbed possession of their properties, prerogatives, and churches, and in the free exercise of their

* P. 324.

worship and discipline." The treaty was hardly signed when an army of Russian barbarians, to whom religion was only an incentive to greater crimes and more unbridled excesses, was sent to extirpate the Catholic faith from Poland. Again, when Gregory XVI. addressed his famous remonstrance to the Emperor Nicholas, whom he summoned to meet him before the tribunal of God, the latter wrote to him immediately after the interview, the following letter:—"The Emperor begs the Sovereign Pontiff to be firmly persuaded that no one has more at heart than his majesty, to maintain the Roman Church on a worthy and becoming footing in Russia as in Poland. The prayers which his majesty addresses to Heaven embrace with an equal solicitude, and without distinction of religious profession, the spiritual interests of all the peoples of whom Divine Providence has confided to him the destiny. *The imperial word is a guarantee to His Holiness of this intention.*" On another occasion the same Emperor thus addressed the Pope:—"My son has exactly reported to me the affectionate words which Your Holiness deigned to convey to me through him. It is a pleasure to me to reply by the renewed assurance that I will never cease to count among the number of my highest duties, that of protecting the welfare of my Catholic subjects, respecting their convictions, and assuring their repose." The fulfilment of these promises was a long series of persecutions worthy of Nero or Tiberius. In the works of Theiner and the Count d'Horner all the details of his crimes against justice and mercy may be found. We have no space to record them. They have been imitated by his son now reigning. After pledging himself formally to grant a complete amnesty to the Poles, a promise which, as Lord Clarendon said, was only "a cruel deception," Alexander II. addressed an assembly of Polish nobles at Warsaw in this shameful language:—"It is my intention that the order established by my father shall be maintained. Therefore, gentlemen, and above all, no dreams! no dreams! what my father did was well done, and I will maintain it. My reign will be a continuation of his." And when one of the leading nobles manifested a desire to speak, he turned to him and added:—"Have you understood me? I would rather be able to reward than to punish; but know and keep the words in mind, that if it should be necessary I shall restrain and punish, and you will see that I shall punish severely."* It was truly said by Prince Dolgoroukow that despotism is even more demoralizing to those who use than to those who endure it.

* De Mazade, "La Pologne Contemporaine," ch. iii. p. 93.

The second point which we have to notice is quite as characteristic of Russian orthodoxy. The earliest Greek missionaries, as Theiner and others have proved, sent from Constantinople to Kief and Moscow, were despatched by S. Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, a devout subject of the Holy See, by whose sentence his worthless rival Photius was excommunicated. S. Ignatius is at this day revered as a saint by the Russian Church, and all the true Slavonic saints—like S. Nicholas, who is the popular patron of the whole Russian nation—were fervent Catholics, and canonized by the authority of Roman Pontiffs. Even Photius, the founder of the Greek schism, is disavowed by the Russian Church. "The origin of the Russian schism," observes Prince Galitzin, "is so shameful that it has not the courage to venerate its own founder, while, among its thousand happy contradictions, it unites with the Universal Church in the solemn celebration, on the 23rd of October, of the memory of S. Ignatius, the first victim of that founder."* "No orthodox Russian," observes Lescœur, "can consult his own liturgy, keep the festivals of his own religion, read the most ancient, authorized, and solid works of piety, without finding in them all S. Peter and his rights, the Holy See and its prerogatives, transmitted intact from S. Peter to his successors, without detecting in them finally the very doctrine of the Roman Church." Many Russian writers frankly admit, what is impossible to deny, that "the Greek Church to the time of Photius, and after him to that of Michael Cerularius, was *Roman Catholic*," and that the Russian Church was equally so till the fourteenth century. "If the Russian Church never admitted the Roman supremacy, how is it that she has allowed so many passages to creep into her liturgy, in which at this very hour she still celebrates, with an enthusiasm which the West hardly equals, 'the Pope S. Celestine, who, firm in his words and works, and following in the steps of the Apostles, proved himself worthy to occupy the Holy See by deposing by his rescripts the impious Nestorius (Patriarch of Constantinople)'? Or again, 'the Pope S. Agapetus, who deposed the heretic Anthimus (also Patriarch of Constantinople), who said anathema to him, then consecrated Mennas, a person of irreproachable doctrine, and placed him in the see of Constantinople? And the Pope S. Martin, who separated from the Church of Jesus Christ Cyrus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, and all their adherents?' Do you wish to know how a Pope can write to an Emperor? The Russian liturgy will tell you.

* "L'Eglise Gréco-Russe," p. 6.

It quotes Gregory II., who wrote to Leo the Isaurian on the subject of the veneration of image: 'We, *who are invested with the power and the sovereignty of S. Peter*, have decreed to interdict you,' &c. It is again the Russian Church which teaches us, in a fragment of the life of S. John Chrysostom, that a Pope can excommunicate not only a Patriarch, but an Emperor, whether of the East or West. 'Pope Innocent,' it says, 'separated Arcadius and his wife Eudisia from Christian communion, and pronounced anathema upon all who had taken part in driving S. John Chrysostom from his see. As to Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, not only he deprived him of his rank, but cut him off from the Church. Arcadius, the Emperor, wrote in reply to Pope Innocent, humbly imploring his forgiveness and assuring him of his repentance.' Such is at this day the testimony which the Russian Church *in her liturgical books* bears against herself. The conclusion is evident. Either the Russian theologians must cease to imitate Protestants in their invectives against the Papacy, or abolish their own liturgy.*

We have now cleared the way for the inquiry to which the work of Mr. Wallace furnishes the latest reply. A religion false to its own origin, and in formal contradiction with the Apostles by whom it was promulgated,—used as an instrument of national policy, and degraded into the unspiritual observance of external rites and ceremonies,—can contribute nothing to the formation of genuine Christian virtue, and is sure to reduce both clergy and people to the same level. "We are Christians," says Tchadaief, "but so are the Abyssinians." The monster Ivan the Terrible is in one respect a type of that union of depravation of character, with the punctilious performance of outward rites which is said to be so common in Russia. When a certain Nicholas, who must have been a man of courage, presented to him a piece of raw flesh, the hideous savage replied, "I am a Christian, and eat no flesh during a fast." "But thou doest worse," was the retort of Nicholas, "thou dost eat the flesh of men." When he died, "he sent," says Horsey, "for magicians out of the North, where there is store."† Modern writers give exactly the same account of the combination of fanatical superstition with habitual immorality, and even with pagan practices, in the Russians of the present day. Yet it is certain that they possess qualities, including a deep reverence for the supernatural, which only need Christian teaching and example, and

* Lescœur, t. ii. pp. 514-517.

† Quoted by Ralston, "Early Russian History," pp. 145, 148.

the wholesome air of liberty, to constitute the foundation of a true spiritual life. That teaching and example it is their sad destiny to seek in vain. Russians agree with writers of other nations in reporting that they have only contempt for their official pastors, for whom the sacred ministry is not so much a religious as a civil function, and whose existence, made up of poverty and arbitrary oppression, is in all but the chief cities of the empire, as Prince Dolgoroukow sympathetically observes, "*une longue suite de souffrances.*"* The idea of a vocation to the Christian priesthood, to be tested by spiritual experts, seems to have been long extinct in Russia. Golovine, himself a Russian priest, informs us that if any person of influence "ask an archbishop to make a sacristan a priest, a priest he will be, even though he know not how to write."† This indifference to the most essential qualifications, spiritual or intellectual, is displayed in other branches of the Greek schism. Dr. Döllinger quotes the letter of a Greek writer addressed to the Archbishop of Cephalonia, in which he says, "It might happen to any one to dismiss a servant one day for misconduct, and meet him on the morrow as a priest; people whom you have known as petty chandlers, day-labourers, or boatmen, you may see in a few days appear at the altar or in the pulpit."‡ From such a clergy, to whom the ministry is only a secular calling, nothing can be expected but the mechanical performance of rites which they neither respect nor understand. And therefore Haxthausen, though an official Russian advocate, admits that the Russian priests have no qualifications "for the duties of a missionary"; and even adds that "their sterility is undoubtedly attributable to their separation from Rome."§ Nothing can be less surprising than that Schnitzler should describe a fallen Church, in which even the clergy are of such a character, as "stationary, withered by the spirit of formalism, and deprived of every principle of liberty";|| or that Golovine should add, "every one knows that the number of unbelievers continually increases." Xavier de Hell, though decorated with the order of S. Wladimir by the Tsar, declares that "nothing can be compared to the demoralization of the Russian clergy, whose ignorance is only equalled by their vice. The greater part of the monks and priests spend their lives in shameful inebriety, which renders them incapable of fulfilling decently their religious

* P. 347.

† "*Mémoires d'un Prêtre Russe,*" ch. x. p. 202.

‡ "*The Church and the Churches,*" p. 125.

§ "*Etudes sur la Russie,*" t. i. ch. xiv. p. 441.

|| "*Histoire intime de la Russie,*" notes, p. 472.

duties."* "In ignorance, vulgarity, I may almost say degradation," observes Colonel Poulett Cameron, in spite of his good will to Russia, "they are perfectly without parallel in any religion throughout the world, not even excepting Greece, the natives of which country themselves admit the minor orders of their clergy to be the most abandoned miscreants in the world."† Dr. Döllinger quotes a Russian writer who says, "In all street ballads and popular ribaldry the priest, the deacon, and their wives, are always brought in as examples of the absurd and the despicable"; and lastly, Theiner proves by official documents, and the report of the Supreme Procurator to his Imperial Master, that in the space of four years one-sixth of the whole Russian clergy were under sentence of the public tribunals, and most of them "for infamous crimes."‡ And this is the Church and religion of which the Senator Stcherbinin said to devout and enlightened Catholics, "The Emperor wills, and God also wills, that you should be orthodox." It may be true of the Emperor, but certainly cannot be true of God, unless we suppose—if it may be said without profanity—that the Most High is more solicitous for the triumph of Russian policy, with all its base hypocrisy, inveterate selfishness, and ferocious cruelty, than for the purity of revealed truth, the freedom and dignity of His elect, the honour of His Church, and the virtues of the Christian life.

The revelations which are now multiplying on every side as to the real state of Russia,—where the Atheism of the Nihilists is rampant, not only in the universities, but even in the *seminaries*, and which administrative measures are powerless to check,—may not be immediately fatal to the dreadful imposture of "Tsarodoxy," but will at least present it in its true light to the judgment of Europe. Every new witness confirms the testimony of those who preceded him. "Is the Russian Church," asks Mr. Grant Duff, who is no adversary of Russia, "of any use to the Government in working for the enlightenment of the people, even in the humblest way? No one, I fear, dare answer that question in the affirmative."|| After observing that "card-playing to excess and drunkenness" are "the peculiar weakness of the Russian country clergy," he adds that, whatever individual exceptions there may be, "the lower type is disastrously common, so common as to be a distinctly minus quantity in estimating the

* "Les Steppes de la Mer Caspienne," t. i. p. 120.

† "Georgia, Circassia, and Russia," vol. ii. p. 205.

‡ "L'Eglise Schismatique Russe," ch. vi. p. 138.

§ "The Nineteenth Century," March, 1877, p. 82.

moral and material resources of the empire." That the civil rulers of such a Church should savagely persecute all who refuse to belong to it, is one of the darkest facts in human history. "Even in our own times," says Mr. Grant Duff, "the Russian Church has shown itself intolerant, not only in theory but in acts. I will not quote well-known cases during the reign of Nicholas, but it may surprise some readers to learn that in the year 1865, in the beneficent reign of Alexander the Second, a Russian lady, who came about as near the absolute realization of the ideal most widely accepted by Christendom, as it is possible to imagine, asked, and asked in vain, to be allowed to return to St. Petersburg for the purpose of assisting, in her capacity of Sister of Charity, to nurse the sick during the outburst of cholera which took place in that year. To this hour a Russian of the Orthodox Church who quits it to join another communion, commits a criminal offence."

The same writer, speaking of "the nine or ten millions of its subjects who stand in a more or less hostile position to the official Church," says: "With the exception of a few who are more or less Protestant in their character, all the sects, hierarchical, anti-hierarchical, schismatics, and heretics alike, are the product of even grosser ignorance than that which broods deep and dark over the orthodox." He adds that, "thanks partly to the convenient venality of the orthodox clergy and of the police, the lot of the dissidents is far more tolerable than it used to be. Nominally they are beyond the pale of the law in many ways; really they are not very fiercely or actively oppressed, though of course they are in a position which to our dissidents would seem unutterably dreadful if it had to be exchanged for theirs." The frightful severity practised by the late Emperor Nicholas against all separatists from the Russian Church ended, as Mr. Dixon observes, in increasing their numbers. "The Emperor Nicholas would not hear of any one falling from his Church . . . and never, perhaps, until his dying hour did Nicholas learn the truth about those men whom the breath of his anger was supposed to have swept away! The result of thirty years of savage persecution is, that these non-conformists are to-day more numerous, wealthy, concentrated than they were on the day that Nicholas began his reign." Mr. Dixon adds the curious statement, that "already it is felt in governing circles that nothing can be safely done in Russia unless the Old Believers like it. Every new suggestion laid before the Council of Ministers is met, I have been told, by the query—What will the Old Believers say?"*

* "Free Russia," vol. i. ch. xxvii. p. 285.

The impotence of Russian persecution is further demonstrated by the fact that "these Old Believers are as much the enemies of an official empire as they are of an official church. The test of loyalty in Russia is praying for the reigning prince as a good emperor and a good Christian; but many of these Old Believers will not pray for him at all. Some will pray for him as Tsar, though not as Emperor; but none will pray for him as a Christian man. The word emperor, they say, means Cherk—Black One (Devil); the double eagle, an evil spirit; the autocracy a kingdom of antichrist."* The Marquis de Custine, whose opinion was founded on personal observation, had good reason to say, "it is by religious divisions that the Russian empire will perish."†

We will quote only one more witness before we conclude with a few extracts from the volumes of Mr. Wallace. One of our most acute and discriminating journalists observed lately that Englishmen "will have time and opportunity to learn what sort of a community they are desirous of calling in to punish Turkish vices, and to profit by Turkish ruin. Till quite recently we knew nothing of Russia or Russian society . . . But better knowledge of the country is rapidly becoming available . . . On the 27th and 28th of February we were able to publish a summary of the report of an *Imperial Russian Commission* on the degree of civilization and morality prevailing among the Russian peasantry, who, in a community without a middle class, and without a nobility, are, in fact, the Russian nation. The question for the fanatics who follow Mr. Gladstone is becoming a very serious one. Is all this enthusiasm, all this declamation, all these appeals to a higher law against the obligations of a treaty, to end in committing the regeneration of Turkey to the representatives of a nation charged by its government with universal drunkenness, idleness, and theft, and with more than Turkish ignorance, and more than Turkish superstition?"‡ The facts attested by the Imperial Commission are thus summarized in the same journal, and as they enable us to appreciate the hopeless sterility of the so-called Orthodox Church, we make no apology for reproducing them. "Russia, since 1862, has been literally drunk with vodka." This is proved by "the most striking statements of the Imperial Commission. In the province of Yaroslaf there has been 'a continual increase of drunkenness.' In Kief 'the peasants have become poorer owing to excessive

* Ch. xxvii. p. 289.

† "La Russie en 1839," Letter xxii. p. 134.

‡ *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 5, 1877.

drunkenness. Everything is done for vodka and by vodka.' From the once famous province of Tambof, we hear that the mayor 'stands uncovered before the village assembly, and is sometimes forced to retire to the dram-shop with the rest of the villagers.' Kursk, in Southern Russia, shows an increase in the number of dram-shops. The peasant does not drink vodka every day, but when he does drink he indulges till he becomes unconscious. For drink he spends his last copeck. When accused of a delinquency, he pleads insensibility from drink.' And so on with sickening iteration. The universal drunkenness is, however, only part of a general decline of morality. 'Stealing timber is considered no sin.' 'Robbery is so developed that a wife robs her husband, the children their parents, and the stolen goods are carried to the dram-shop.' 'The rights of property were never very strictly observed by the peasantry. Crimes against those rights are not only daily but hourly on the increase.' 'Theft is developed to an alarming extent. No redress is to be had from the magistrates.' An apologist for the peasantry is driven to urge, 'From whence is the peasant to acquire a respect for the property of others? It is easier to use than not to use the property of others, especially as God knows to what condition the dram-shops have brought the peasantry. Sexual morality seems to have sunk to the same point as social morality. The physical penalty on licentiousness prevails throughout Russia. There are many villages in which no man, woman, or child has escaped its effects; in the province of Poltava alone 100,000 persons were suffering from it in one form or another.' "

Both the State and the Church, the same writer adds, are immediately responsible for these horrible results. "The Russian exchequer raises a prodigious amount of revenue on alcoholic liquor . . . The State must become bankrupt unless the subject gets drunk. But the grossest omissions and misfeasances are those of the Russian Church. The evidence that the Russian clergy not only do not check, but positively encourage drunkenness, seems to be quite overwhelming, and it is the more striking because the witnesses heard by the Imperial Commissioners plainly suppose that morality and religion ought to be convertible terms. The influence of the clergy (in the province of Moscow) is in a state of continual decadence. The priesthood . . . presents not the slightest example of morality, and is frequently given to drink." "The clergy (in Yaroslaf) are not equal to their mission . . . It happens not unfrequently that the priests are not sober when performing the offices of religion." The priests in the province of Vladimir "give way to exactly the

same acts which form so painful a feature in peasant life." It would seem that the Russian clergy directly contribute to the spread of idleness and intoxication in other ways than by their example. It is for their interest to have as many holy days (i.e. saints' days) as possible, and it is on saints' days that the peasant does nothing but drink. Some priests actually "invent holidays, without, however, performing divine service on such days, when the peasants suspend their work, and take to the bottle." This observance of the outward forms of religion, while living in habitual violation of its precepts, if not the exclusive mark of Russian "orthodoxy," is, at all events, its distinguishing feature.

We come, at length, to the work of Mr. Wallace. It is the product of nearly six years' observation in Russia, and of converse with every class of its population in their own language. In every point it confirms the witnesses whom we have already cited. Mr. Wallace avows a friendly feeling towards the country which he describes, and judges it so leniently, that he does not once allude to its crimes against Catholics, and to what Mr. Grant Duff calls "the worst of the things that have taken place in Poland proper, or in the western provinces of Russia." He describes, but does not compare, and we must not expect to find in his pages such a reflection as is expressed in the following sentence of Mr. Grant Duff:—"I have visited only two of the monasteries, one of them the famous Troitza. There are about 500 in all, and it may, I fear, be fairly said that there are not a few single monasteries in the West which have done more for mankind than the whole of them put together." But if Mr. Wallace does not contrast the glories of a divine religion, and the beneficent triumphs of a higher civilization with the unfruitful institutions of Russia, he does not disguise his opinion as to the nature and working of the latter. The following passages occur in his chapter entitled *The Village Priest*.*

In this chapter he narrates a conversation with a priest, of whom he says, "I was a little shocked at hearing the priest speak of his sacred functions as if they were an ordinary marketable commodity, and talk of the inhibition as a pushing undertaker might talk of sanitary improvements." The same priest complained to him that "the higher places in the ecclesiastical administration all belong to the black clergy—that is to say, they are all monks—and consequently, cannot understand our wants. How can they, on whom celibacy is imposed by the rules of the Church, understand the position of a parish

* Vol. i. ch. iv. p. 76.

priest who has to bring up a family, and to struggle with domestic cares of every kind? What they do is to take all the comfortable places for themselves, and leave us all the hard work. Perhaps you have heard that the parish priests extort money from the peasant, refusing to perform the rites of baptism or burial until a considerable sum has been paid. It is only too true; but who is to blame? The priest must live, and bring up his family; and you cannot imagine the humiliations to which he has to submit, in order to gain a scanty pittance. I know it by experience. When I make the periodical visitation, I can see that the peasants grudge every handful of rye, and every egg that they give me. I can overhear their sneers as I go away, and I know they have many sayings, such as—"The priest takes from the living and from the dead." Many of them fasten their doors, pretending to be away from home, and do not even take the precaution of keeping silent till I am out of hearing."

"You surprise me," I said, in reply to the last part of this long tirade; "I have always heard that the Russians are a very religious people—at least, the lower classes."

"So they are; but the peasantry are poor and heavily taxed. They set great importance on the Sacrament, and observe rigorously the fasts, which comprise nearly a half of the year, but they show very little respect for their priests, who are almost as poor as themselves."

The impression created on the mind of Mr. Wallace by this conversation appears to have been too amply confirmed by later inquiries and larger experience. "Since that time," he says, "I have frequently spoken on this subject with competent authorities, and nearly all have admitted that the present condition of the clergy is highly unsatisfactory, and that the parish priest rarely enjoys the respect of his parishioners. In a semi-official report . . . the facts are stated in the following plain language:—'The people'—I seek to translate as literally as possible—'do not respect the clergy, but persecute them with derision and reproaches, and feel them to be a burden. In nearly all the popular comic stories, the priest, his wife, or his labourer, is held up to ridicule, and in all the proverbs and popular sayings where the clergy are mentioned it is always with derision. The people shun the clergy, and have recourse to them, not from the inner impulse of conscience, but from necessity . . . And why do the people not respect the clergy? Because it forms a class apart; because, having received a false kind of education, it does not introduce into the life of the people the teaching of the Spirit, but remains in the mere dead forms of outward ceremonial, at

the same time despising these forms even to blasphemy; because the clergy itself continually presents examples of want of respect to religion, and transforms the service of God into a profitable trade. Can the people respect the clergy when they hear how one priest stole money from below the pillow of a dying man at the moment of confession; how another was publicly dragged out of a house of ill-fame; how a third christened a dog; how a fourth, whilst officiating at the Easter service, was dragged by the hair from the altar by the deacon? Is it possible for the people to respect priests who spend their time in the gin-shop, write fraudulent petitions, fight with the cross in their hands, and abuse each other in bad language at the altar? One might fill several pages with examples of this kind—in each instance naming the time and place—without overstepping the boundaries of the province of Nizhni-Novgorod. Is it possible for the people to respect the clergy when they see everywhere amongst them simony, carelessness in performing the religious rites, and disorder in administering the sacraments? Is it possible for the people to respect the clergy when they see that truth has disappeared from it, and that the consistories, guided in their decisions, not by rules, but by personal friendship and bribery, destroy in it the last remains of truthfulness? If we add to all this the false certificates which the clergy give to those who do not wish to partake of the Eucharist, the dues illegally extracted from the old ritualists, the conversion of the altar into a source of revenue, the giving of churches to priests' daughters as a dowry, and similar phenomena, the question as to whether the people can respect the clergy requires no answer." The statements in this disastrous narrative, Mr. Wallace adds, were presented in a "secret" report to the Grand Duke Constantine by Mr. Melnikof, "an orthodox Russian, celebrated for his extensive and intimate knowledge of Russian provincial life."

It may seem superfluous to add anything to this authentic description, addressed to a member of the imperial family, of the life and character of the Russian clergy. But we may be allowed to remark that it is the system under which they live, rather than any inherent or incurable depravity of their own nature, which is responsible for these dark results. Both clergy and people, we may confidently believe, would know how to appreciate higher models if they were set before them, and rise without difficulty to a nobler and purer life if they had the advantage of Christian education, and were released from the fetters of "tsarodoxy." It is the crushing legacy of Peter I. and his despotic successors, who have enslaved the unhappy

Russian Church, and degraded religion into an instrument of their own evil policy, which overwhelms in a common ruin the souls and minds of the Russian people. No nation has a better title to the sympathetic pity of free Christian communities. The history of its moral declension, and continual progress towards a lower level, inspires compassion rather than disgust or aversion. The spiritual life of Russia is strangled by a barbarous and impious oppression, which aims only at the exaltation of a single family, and prostrates religion at the feet of an autocrat, who uses it for what he falsely deems a policy advantageous to himself and to the nation which he governs. No other consideration finds a place in his counsels. The Russian Church is a tool which he uses for his own objects. "Some ingenious people," says Mr. Wallace, "who wish to prove that the creation of the Synod was not an innovation, represent the institution as a resuscitation of the ancient local councils; but this view is utterly untenable. The Synod is not a council of deputies from various sections of the Church, but a permanent college, or ecclesiastical senate, the members of which are appointed and dismissed by the Emperor *as he thinks fit*. It has no independent legislative authority, for its legislative projects do not become law till they have received the Imperial sanction; and they are always published, not in the name of the Church, but in the name of the Supreme Power. Even in matters of simple administration, it is not independent, for all its resolutions require the consent of the Procureur, a layman nominated by his Majesty."*

We have heard what Mr. Wallace reports of the official Church, and it will not be without interest to read what he says of the Dissenters. "In persecution, as in all other manifestations, the Russian Church directs its attention chiefly to external forms. It never seeks to ferret out heresy in a man's opinions, but complacently accepts as orthodox all who annually appear at confession and communion, and who refrain from acts of open hostility. Those who can make these concessions to convenience are practically free from molestation, and those who cannot thus trifle with their conscience have an equally convenient method of escaping persecution. The parish clergy, with their customary indifference to things spiritual, and their traditional habit of regarding their functions from the financial point of view, are hostile to sectarianism, chiefly because it diminishes their revenues by diminishing the number of parishioners requiring their ministrations. This

* Vol. ii. ch. xxvii. p. 183.

cause of hostility can easily be removed by a certain pecuniary sacrifice on the part of the sectarians; and accordingly there generally exists between them and their parish priest a tacit contract, by which both parties are perfectly satisfied. The priest receives his income as if all his parishioners belonged to the State Church, and the parishioners are left in peace to believe and practise what they please.* This condonation of multiform heresy for a pecuniary consideration is eminently characteristic of the "orthodox" clergy. As orthodoxy means with their rulers subjection to "the will of the Emperor," it means with *them* the payment of their dues. And both are equally indifferent to religious truth. Policy guides the one, and self-interest the other. And between the two, as we have seen, religion and morality disappear. Meanwhile, by a natural recoil from such an official religion as has been described to us by those who know it best, the disposition to fall away from the State Church receives constantly a new impulse. "In certain districts," Mr. Wallace says, "nearly every village has one or two independent sects." He adds that, in spite of all that has been attempted to check their progress, already "the sectarians constitute about an eighth of the whole population of the empire." This fact, he concludes, "proves satisfactorily that the Russian people is by no means so docile and pliable as is commonly supposed, and that it is capable of showing a stubborn passive resistance to authority when it believes great interests to be at stake. The dogged energy which it has displayed in asserting for centuries its religious liberty may perhaps some day be employed in the arena of politics." Another recent English writer reports, on the authority of a Russian priest, that "half the people, even now, are Old Believers; more than three-fourths will be the moment we are free."†

If the people manifest more and more a disposition to separate from a Church which they hate and despise, the upper classes, though affecting to belong to it in submission to Russian policy, are to a large extent estranged from it still more effectually. "Whilst the masses," says Mr. Wallace, "clung obstinately to their time-honoured customs and beliefs, the nobles came to look on the objects of popular veneration as the relics of a barbarous past, of which a civilized nation ought to be ashamed." As an illustration of the progress of unbelief, he adds that "the famous Speranski relates that in the seminary of St. Petersburg one of his professors, when not in a state of intoxication, was in the habit of preaching the doctrines of Voltaire and Diderot!" Recent official docu-

* Vol. ii. ch. xx. p. 10.

† Dixon, "Free Russia," vol. i. p. 287.

ments attest that Nihilism, which is a denial of all religion, has invaded even the ecclesiastical schools, in which the future clergy of Russia are being educated. The support of "orthodoxy" for purely political and national objects, of which all intelligent Russians understand the true character, is producing the same effect at both extremities of the social scale. "Having often heard," observes Mr. Wallace, "that the Russians were an intensely religious people, I was somewhat surprised to find, during my first sojourn in St. Petersburg, that those with whom I came in contact seemed singularly indifferent to religious matters."* Larger experience did not diminish his surprise. "My subsequent prolonged acquaintance with the Moscovites"—i.e. the Russians of Moscow—"tended to confirm rather than dispel the impression received in St. Petersburg." This indifference, the same competent witness assures us, is shared by the clergy. "All that the Russian clergy demand is that those who have been born within the pale of Orthodoxy should show the Church a certain nominal allegiance; and in this matter of allegiance they are by no means very exacting." Elsewhere he expresses the pious wish that "the Orthodox Church could instil into the minds of the peasantry a few simple moral principles," and adds, "but this is, for the present at least, not to be expected. The great majority of the parish clergy are men utterly unfit for such a task, and the few who have any aspirations in that direction rarely, if ever, acquire a perceptible moral influence over their parishioners."† As the Russian priest rarely preaches or exhorts," it is quite natural that their flocks should be, as he says, "profoundly ignorant of religious doctrine," and even invoke the saints, real or imaginary, to assist them in committing the worst crimes; while "the educated Russians, as a rule, take no interest in Church matters, and not a few of them are so very far 'advanced' that they regard religion in all its forms as an old-world superstition, which should be allowed to die as tranquilly as possible." Perhaps it was the contemplation during so many years of these dismal phenomena which made this friendly witness exclaim: "We need not attempt to decide whether it is better for humanity that Russia should exist as a nation."‡

Such, then, is what Muscovite official documents call "Holy Russia"! Such is the great imposture of modern ages, from which the veil has at last been torn away. And it is to maintain such a system, in spite of the claims of God and the rights of man, that the whole autocratic power of Russia is

* Vol. ii. ch. xxvii. p. 175. † Ch. xxxi. p. 355. ‡ Ch. xiii. p. 308.

expended. That it should find advocates and apologists in our own country is one of the least intelligible facts of our generation, and is to be accounted for only by taking into account the unscrupulous character of political and party warfare. Let despotism be applauded, vice and ignorance excused, and the destruction of all genuine religion condoned, if by such felonies an impediment can be thrown in the way of our own Government, and the semblance of a victory snatched by its opponents. Such is the transparent motive of speeches and pamphlets which reflect only dishonour upon those who speak and write them. It is true that one advantage has resulted from these noxious declamations, inasmuch as they have only served to call attention to the real character of Russian religion and policy, and to convince the sober and reflecting part of our community that of all wild and irrational dreams none is more hurtful and mendacious than the notion that Russia can dispense to other nations the very benefits of liberty, justice, and piety which she has destroyed in her own. "When we are asked," says a conspicuous English journal, "to sympathize with the enthusiasm of the Russians for the cause of the Slavonic Christians, we are forced by the necessity of the case to dwell on the nature of Slavonic Christianity in Russia, and on the moral teaching of its ministers."* And the result of investigation, aided by Russian official documents, adds the same journal, is to show that while the Russian people have all the vices of the Turks, and some which Turks have not, "their priests are extremely immoral, and hardly more spiritual-minded than the hierophants of an African fetish." For this and other reasons, the writer remarks, with reference to Mr. Gladstone's latest pamphlet, "we think it right to observe on the mischievous indirect effects which are being produced everywhere by the sanguinary and sensational literature to which this publication belongs." As far as such writings have any effect at all, they can but promote the very evils to which they affect to apply a remedy, by encouraging a power which has ever been the chief source of such calamities, and striving to infuse new life into what contemporary revelations have proved to be an organized system of cruelty, unbelief, superstition, depravity, and imposture.

If, however, the political aspect of the question which we have been considering is full of gravity, the religious lessons which it suggests to every enlightened conscience are immeasurably more momentous. They are especially instructive, we think, to that class of our Anglican fellow-countrymen who

* *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 13.

have been accustomed to rely on Russia as a valuable confederate in resisting the authority of the Holy See, and who are now attempting to emancipate themselves from the control of the civil power in the sphere of conscience. To these men we wish all the spiritual blessings to which they aspire, and more; but the first step to obtain them is to unlearn delusions which they have inherited from others, and of which their actual position tends to confirm the fatal power. From Russia they can hardly expect to derive any further consolation. While the liturgical books of the Russian Church contain, as we have seen, the most explicit recognition of the supreme and universal authority of the Chair of Peter, its abject prostration under the uncontested supremacy of a despotic lay pontiff affords little encouragement to the idea that revolt against the Apostolic See promotes the acquisition of religious freedom. The example of Russia is fatal to that supposition. The subjection of the official Church of England, from the first hour of its existence, to the edicts, first of the monarch, and now of Parliament, is a fact equally emphatic and decisive. For long ages our Catholic forefathers, clergy and people alike, looked to the Roman Pontiff, and never in vain, for a sure defence against the tyranny of evil princes and the encroachments of the temporal power. Nothing in the ecclesiastical history of England is more clearly and abundantly established. "The Pope," said Lanfranc, "has ever been the whole strength and support of the See of Canterbury." When his authority was denied, it was usurped, with the cheerful and reiterated assent of the new Anglican Church, by princes who became to it exactly what the Russian Tsars have been, and continue to be, to the enslaved community in which they have crushed at the same time religion, life, and liberty. Is there no lesson in this ever-recurring penalty of revolt against the Chair of Peter? Is there none in the ceaseless multiplication of sects both in Russia and England, and their common aversion to the body from which they sprang? In such parallel calamities, both Russians and Englishmen, in whom the spiritual sense is not extinguished, may see the fruits of *national churches*, and of alienation from the centre of unity, the fount of spiritual liberty, and the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The hour is perhaps approaching when, by the favour of God, it may be said of England, as Prince Gagarin says of his own country: "Russia does not yet believe that the Papacy is the keystone of the arch of Christianity, but she begins to cherish a suspicion of it."*

* "Tendances Catholiques dans la Société Russe," p. 41.

ART. II.—FREDERIC OZANAM.

Frederic Ozanam: His Life and Works. By KATHLEEN O'MEARA.
Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas. 1876.

PERE GRATRY has said somewhere in his writings that one difference between the society of the Middle Ages and of these later centuries consists in this, "Society then was Catholic, and sustained men above themselves, but now society is Catholic no longer, and drags men downwards with itself." The truth of this is to be seen perhaps more clearly in France and in this century than in any other period or country. The first French Revolution decatholicised the society of France. Its Catholicism has survived in individuals, and yet they have, with exceptions indeed, shown the depressing and distorting power of the society into which they were born, and by which they were nurtured. What the Germans call the "Time-Spirit" is powerful everywhere, but it has shown its subtilty and its supremacy nowhere more visibly than in the noble and chivalrous race of Catholics who have so powerfully urged onward the reaction towards faith in France since the year 1830.

M. de Broglie has said that the principles of 1789 were formulated and published not only as a charter for France but as a Gospel for mankind. M. Thiers said to a bishop on his way to the Council, "Do not attack the principles of 1789; whoso touches them touches the marrow of Frenchmen." They have penetrated into the intelligence and created a public opinion which affects even those who resist them. To this fact we may ascribe two phenomena strange and sad in the Catholic action of France for the last forty years; namely, that those who were labouring in the Catholic reaction to restore faith, piety, and fidelity to the Holy See, were divided, and opposed to each other, and that one band of men for whose devotion, piety, intellectual elevation, and chivalrous fidelity to the Catholic Church, every Catholic must have admiration, should have been so perceptibly, though, we believe, unconsciously, affected by the Time-Spirit created by the principles of 1789.

Frederic Ozanam was one of the most brilliant of the brilliant band of Catholic writers in whom this can be traced. We are, therefore, desirous of making unmistakably clear our

judgment on these points before we go on to express our profound admiration and affectionate sympathy with him and many of those who were associated with him in this noble conflict for the Catholic Faith against the infidel politics and Voltairean society of Paris and of France.

The youth of France were the offspring of the infidel University of the First Napoleon. Neither under the Restoration, nor under the reign of Louis Philippe, was its destructive influence counteracted. Society was either infidel and indifferent, or Voltairean, that is, infidel and scoffing. Such a society pulled down all its members; and into such a society Frederic Ozanam was born. It might be divided into three classes. First came the non-Catholics, who believed nothing; secondly, the Catholics who gave splendid examples of a perfect fidelity to the Church; and, thirdly, those who may be called Catholics *juxta modum*; that is to say, they were in some particulars and details affected by the Time-Spirit of their age and country. Nevertheless, among these were some of the noblest and most chivalrous sons of the Church, and some also of the most ardent and loving Christians and true soldiers of Jesus Christ. It seems to us, that we ought to render justice to all such men. And we feel that we can do so without incurring a suspicion of our being "liberal Catholics." We have had our *baptismus opprobriorum* as Ultramontanes, and even as ultra-Catholic and ultra-ultramontane. Our chief mission has been to learn of the living voice of the Vicar of Jesus Christ and to repeat his utterances with a perfect fidelity. We therefore claim to ourselves the freedom of speaking generously of those who in our judgment may not in some things have followed the guidance of the Holy See, for we have bought that freedom with the great price of no little odium and no sparing censure for our extreme ultramontanism.

It seems to us to be the duty of justice, not to speak of charity, that while we remain inflexible in our own attitude we should endeavour, as far as possible, to appreciate at its full all that is high, noble, truthful, and Catholic in them; and while we note the points in which we believe them to have come short, to render to their lives, characters, and memories the fullest recognition of what they were. We say their memories, because of those of whom we have to speak hardly one survives.

Between the years 1830 and 1850 there arose in France a group of men whose lives have left an indelible mark upon their country. The period of De Maistre and Chateaubriand was followed by that of Lamennais, De Bonald, De Salignis

Gerbet, Lacordaire, Montalambert, Ozanam, Rio, Combalot, Cochin, and, in its later time, Gratry; and, we must add, as a youthful disciple called away before he had inscribed his name by toil, Henry Perreyve.*

While conscious of divergencies and deviations in certain things, it was impossible not to see and to love the noble character of these men. Endowed with great natural gifts, and with wide and various cultivation, there was one thing in common with them all,—a great mental beauty, and a great breadth of heart. No one can have read the writings of Gerbet, Rio, Ozanam, Montalembert, and Gratry, nobody can have known Henry Perreyve, without seeing and feeling the singular beauty of their intelligence, and the generous impulses of their character.

We have no fear in rendering this just and affectionate tribute to their memory; and if in any thing we have at times strongly opposed their way of judging and speaking, we never forgot, and never shall cease to declare, that they were noble sons of France, which had marked them for its own with some of the best tokens of its less stable age. There is also another truth to be borne in mind. If we were to try the language of some of the Antenicene Fathers by the terminology fixed by the Council of Nicæa, we should find matter for criticism. In like manner, if we were to try the writings of some of the noblest and most fervent defenders of the Catholic Faith and of the Holy See in France by the later tests of the Syllabus and of the Vatican Council, we should commit an injustice. At that period we might have been as they were, without an exact terminology, and with questions as yet undecided.

With these few words of precaution, we will give a slight sketch of the life of Frederic Ozanam, of his character, and of the work he has left behind him. But first we must very warmly commend the work of Miss O'Meara, which is written with great fulness, but with no prolixity. It would have been impossible to set before us any adequate notion of Ozanam's singularly great and fertile mind in a smaller compass. While the author sympathizes with an affectionate reverence with the subject of her biography, she skilfully surrounds certain periods of it with just explanations which show a perception of what an adverse critic might incline to say.

Frederic Ozanam was born at Milan in 1813. He died at Marseilles in 1853. His whole career was therefore contained in forty years. The Ozanam family was, it appears, of Jewish

* With the exception of Lamennais, De Bonald, and Ozanam, it was the good fortune of the writer to know all the others, and some of them with much intimacy.

origin, and of great antiquity. The name of Hozannam is said to be found in the thirty-eighth Roman legion; and a Jewish colony seems to have been planted at Bellignum, or Boulingneux, near Lyons. They were baptized by S. Didier, and thenceforward the Christian name took the place of the old Jewish name. Benedict, the grandfather of Frederic, was the first who changed the orthography to Ozanam. Antoine, father of Frederic, served four years as a conscript under the first Napoleon. But to avoid the political changes in France, he went from Lyons to Milan: Frederic was his second son. The family returned to Lyons soon after his birth. At the age of 16, Frederic wrote a letter to a friend, which is a wonderful evidence of precocity. It is an autobiography, moral, intellectual, and spiritual, which implies an extraordinary self-knowledge, self-observation, and self-discipline. At the age of 17 he describes his first religious doubts and his intense sufferings, which, however, ended in a complete faith. He says, "I believed henceforward with an assured faith, and, touched by this mercy, vowed to consecrate my days to the service of that truth which had given me peace." He studied at Paris under Abbé Noïrot, and soon reached and retained the head of his class. He was destined for the law, but, being so young, his father recalled him for two years to Lyons, where he studied in an actuary's office, but spent his pastime in learning English, German, Hebrew, and Sanscrit. At the age of 18 he wrote a work against the Saint Simonians. His letters at this time show a maturity and thoughtfulness more like eight-and-twenty than eighteen. He then began his legal studies in Paris; and found himself in the midst of infidels, scoffers, and blasphemers. Professors and students in this were all alike. At this date he had an interview with Chateaubriand, who asked him whether he had been to the theatre. He said no; Chateaubriand asked him whether he intended to go. Ozanam had promised his mother, who was a fervent Catholic, that he never would; and after some hesitation, he said he had resolved not to go to a theatre. Chateaubriand said very earnestly, "I implore you to be true to that promise to your mother. You would gain nothing at the theatre; and you might lose a great deal."*

The biographer gives an interesting sketch of the state of the University of France, its schools, lycées, and of the Sorbonne, in which infidelity reigned with an absolute sway. Slowly and by chance, one or two Catholic youths found each other out in this atmosphere of unbelief, and joined them-

* "Life," p. 28.

selves together for mutual support. They then began to controvert the sceptical and infidel teaching of the Professors. They wrote answers, which were publicly read out. At last Professor Jouffroy* openly attacked revelation, and was answered by a protest, drawn up by Ozanam, and signed by fifteen Catholic students, which the Professor had to read out to 200 students, and to declare that he never meant to ill-treat Christianity. Ozanam was then under twenty years of age. "Let us cheer up," he wrote to a friend; "the work of God is advancing, and will be accomplished by the youth of this very day; who knows, perhaps, even by you and me?"† This knot of young men then resolved on having an organ or paper. It so happened that some of them lodged in the house of a M. Bailly, who was proprietor of a printing establishment and a newspaper called the "*Tribune Catholique*." A debating society was founded in his house. It was here that Ozanam first found his power of speech. He was continually harassed by the taunts that faith must be shown by good works; and out of this came the conferences of S. Vincent of Paul, of which he was the real founder at the age of twenty, though he always refused to be so regarded. They had as counsellor in their work of charity Sœur Rosalie. These conferences began in 1833, and at this time are spread throughout the Church. In 1834, Lamennais' fall had come, and Lacordaire had begun his Conferences at the Collège Stanislas. Ozanam and he became intimate friends, and it was through Ozanam that Lacordaire was admitted to give his Conferences in Notre Dame. Ozanam had by this time completed his legal studies, and entered on his duties as a barrister. But his drawings were strongly to literature; and at that moment the municipality of Lyons petitioned that he should be appointed to a Chair of Commercial Law about to be founded in Lyons. Ozanam was then only twenty-four. He was, at that age, nominated to the Chair of Commercial Law at Lyons, and at the same date M. Cousin offered to him the Chair of Philosophy at Orleans. In the year 1841 he accepted the office of Assistant Professor of Foreign Literature in the Sorbonne; shortly afterwards the Chair of Literature in the University of Lyons was offered to him. He had by this time only reached his twenty-eighth year. We have brought these facts together as the best way of showing in what estimation he was held by the public men and public authorities of France. His office of Assistant Pro-

* M. Jouffroy died a Christian death in the unity of the faith, and with the ministrations of the Church. Who can say how much Ozanam may have contributed to this happy end?

† Vol. i. p. 56.

fessor at the Sorbonne gave him the first full occasion of putting his powers to the proof. His biographer says,

Ozanam possessed all the elements of the purest eloquence, a ready and retentive memory, a clear conception, a facility for rigidly sketching the outline of his subject, and filling it up in strong, brilliant, and delicate colours (i. p. 196).

Early next morning he would resume the interrupted chain of thought, and then, when the time came, after invoking on his knees the light and aid of the Holy Spirit, he went forth to deliver his message (p. 197).

His manner of lecturing was full of charm; he dispensed his vast erudition with the simplicity of a boy, and with a prodigality that belongs only to inexhaustible abundance. Every one of his lectures was a book condensed into a chapter, and he frequently compressed into a sentence an amount of thought and information, which a mind less magnificently replenished would have diluted into a chapter, telling away in an hour, like the intellectual spendthrift that he was, the treasure it had taken years to accumulate. He stripped knowledge of half its difficulties by his way of imparting it. Knowledge with him was not so much an intellectual system, as a mental habit, which had become a part of his being; he did not divest himself of it, as some men do, taking it up and laying it down at stated times; when the signal came for him to impart it officially, he did not seem to stand up and perform the functions of a Professor so much as to avail himself of an opportunity for revealing the rich deposit of thought, scientific analysis, and observation which life-long study had left in his mind; he gave it out naturally, spontaneously, and with the real enthusiasm of a devout scholar,—devout in the sense of devoted; his devotion to science, and to his own particular branch of it—history—partook of the nature of his religion; it was to his mind what faith was to his soul. It was the spontaneity of his method, united to its finished art, which exercised such fascination on all, and possessed such an unrivalled power of attraction for the young. They were interested and enchanted even before they were convinced. If they arrived at the lecture-hall ignorant of the subject, or indifferent to it, they were quickly excited to a curiosity which put an end to indifference, and stimulated to inquiry and investigation. Few minds ever possessed, in a higher degree, the faculty of kindling the minds of others with his own—a faculty which may be taken as the supreme test of mental and moral power. Ozanam followed the Socratic method, of which he had learned the secret from M. Noirot. Taking hold of the mind on every side, by sympathy, by the reason and the imagination, he compelled the student to work with his own brains while following the working of another's. M. Cousin once exclaimed, on coming out from a lecture of Ozanam's, 'The lyceums and colleges send us distinguished Professors, but the Abbé Noirot sends us men' (p. 197).

We cannot wonder that his power over his hearers was irresistible, and that their attachment to him was a kind of devotion. But all this he used for the end to which at seventeen he had vowed his life:—

It was nearly half a century since the voice of a Christian teacher—a teacher identified with the Christian faith—had been heard in the Sorbonne, while, on the other hand, its walls had echoed unceasingly to every false and fantastic doctrine of the Voltairean and Rationalistic schools; and this absence of talent, or at least this silence amongst the Catholic men in the great seat of learning, went far to sanction the popular idea that talent, not to say genius, had utterly disappeared from the Catholic ranks. But now a new era had begun. At the age of twenty-seven Ozanam took his seat amongst the veterans of the proud old university, and electrified young and old by the splendour of his gifts and the burning ardour of his faith. It was a strange coincidence that the same audience which so lately had listened with delight while Villemain and Cousin exposed their favourite theses, should now hear, with no less favour, those same theses energetically denounced from the same rostrum by the daring new-comer. It was a rash experiment on his part. The State, as yet, held the monopoly of the university, and looked with an evil eye on the men who were leading the war against it in behalf of the rights of the Church. It was natural enough, too, that an assembly of young men, all enlisted in warm partisanship on one side or the other, but amongst whom the opponents of the Church largely predominated, should form a dangerous audience for a professor of Ozanam's ardent religious convictions. But he did not stop to calculate risks; and Fortune, who sides mostly with the brave, stood by the young champion of the Gospel. Here was no sophist, no subtle philosopher striving to palliate hard sayings, or smooth down unpalatable propositions, but a dauntless knight, who rode into the lists with his drawn sword flashing in the sunlight, and, flinging down his gauntlet, dared all comers to pick it up. He dealt in no compromise, he made no concessions to the hostile susceptibilities of his hearers. The sceptics heard him in astonished admiration, the Catholics applauded with a sense of victory (pp. 193—195).

M. Lenormant, a professor of the Sorbonne, had the courage to follow Ozanam's example; but his hearers rose in revolt with hisses and yells, with blasphemous cries. Ozanam was present and—

Unable to contain his indignation, leaped up beside the lecturer, and stood for a moment surveying the tumult with proud defiance. The courageous action drew forth an instantaneous salvo of applause; but Ozanam, with a scornful gesture, commanded silence, and proceeded to tell the assembly what he thought of their behaviour, and what value he set on their plaudits; he spoke with a fiery vehemence that startled all into attention; he adjured them in the name of liberty, which they so loudly invoked, to respect liberty in others, and to allow every man the freedom of his conscience. The effect of the harangue was magical; the tumult ceased, and M. Lenormant continued, or rather began, his lecture, and finished it without interruption. The next day, however, the *cours* was closed by order of the Government; authority thus yielding to violence, when by a little firmness it might so easily have taken the upper hand, and constituted itself

the guardian of social peace, and the bulwark of social principles. This cowardly and cruel precedent did not daunt Ozanam, or induce him to abate one iota of his independence; he continued his lectures without mitigating in the slightest degree the out-and-out Christian tone of his teaching. The boldness of this conduct, while it heightened his prestige with his own party, increased his general popularity. His name became a power in its sphere, and was cited everywhere as an example of the energy and growing strength of the Catholics. It once happened during the noisy days of the Lenormant riots, when the learned Sorbonne was transformed into a battlefield, that some person, meaning to be witty, scratched out the words "littérature étrangère," after Ozanam's name on the door, and wrote over them "théologie." He was informed of this as he was entering the hall. He said nothing until he had finished his lecture, and then, as he was about to descend from his chair, he observed, in a tone of great dignity, "I have not the *honour* to be a theologian, gentlemen; but I have the happiness to believe, and the ambition to place my whole soul with all my might at the service of truth." The courageous profession of faith was greeted by loud and general cheers (pp. 220, 221).

It is not wonderful that such courageous fidelity should have the reward of popularity. Even his enemies were at peace with him:—

A man who represents the most unpopular conviction, who serves it and stands by it through thick and thin, is sure to gain influence in the long-run: undying devotion to a cause eventually conquers the respect of its enemies, though it may not make its champion popular. The qualities of the man himself must do this. He must have a heart, or he must pass for having one. Ozanam was essentially a man of heart. His genius excited admiration, his piety commanded respect, but it was his kindness that made him loved. Lacordaire says that he had a charm, "which, added to his other gifts, completed in his person the artisan of a predestined enchantment. He was gentle to all men, and just towards error" (p. 224).

In 1844 his principal, M. Fauviel, died, and Ozanam was nominated professor for life. In the year 1846—his health and strength had been always frail, and severely taxed by incessant work. He began to give way; but he would not relax his labours. A malignant fever, however, compelled him to submit, and he was sent on a literary mission into Italy. He passed the winter of 1846-1847 in Rome. In 1848 came the Revolution, and the martyrdom, as it may well be called, of the Archbishop of Paris; for he was slain in *odium Christi*, by a spontaneous acceptance of death, for the *bonum commune Reipublicæ et Ecclesiæ*. It is not commonly known that the Archbishop went on this errand of self-oblation at the request of Ozanam and two others. But, before they had suggested it, the Archbishop had already pondered it in his heart, as if by an inspiration. The whole event is touchingly narrated in

the book before us. In 1850 his health again began to fail. He went in search of health to Brittany, and came over to England. Lacordaire has given a characteristic account of his visit to Westminster Abbey:—

“He went in with the crowd of strangers and foreigners, and found himself presently behind the choir, in front of the tomb of St. Edward. The sight of this monument, mutilated by Protestantism, filled him with anguish, and falling on his knees before the relics, such as they are, he prayed there alone in expiation for that people that no longer knows its saints, to the great contempt, doubtless, of the lookers-on, who took him for an idolater, if not for a madman.” We are not surprised to learn that the indignant beadle hunted him out of the church (p. 352).

But these intervals of rest and change were of little avail. The intensity of his mind gave no respite to his failing frame, and in 1852 he was again dangerously ill. Then came his last appearance at the Sorbonne.

He was still confined to his bed, suffering great pain, and consumed with fever, when one day he heard that the public were clamouring for him at the Sorbonne, accusing him of self-indulgence and neglect of duty in being so long absent from his *cours*, when he was paid by the State for giving it. The news stung him to the quick. “I will show them it is not true. I will do honour to my profession!” he cried. And, in spite of the tears of his wife, and the entreaties of his brother and another medical attendant, he had himself dressed and drove straight to the Sorbonne, where he found the crowd still collected outside his class. When the professor, leaning on the arm of a friend, pale, worn, more like a spectre than a living man, advanced through their midst, the rioters were smitten with horror and remorse; as he ascended the chair that had witnessed so many of his triumphs, and that he was never to ascend again, their applause broke forth, rising and falling like waves around him. He stood for some minutes gazing in silence on the thoughtless, cruel young crowd, his black dazzling eyes shining with the terrible light of fever, his long hair hanging, his whole appearance that of a man who was nearer to death than to life. When at last the tumult subsided, he spoke. His voice rang out clear as silver, more piercing from its very weakness, like a spirit imprisoned in a body too frail to bear the shock of its inspiration:—“Gentlemen,” he said, “our age is accused of being an age of egotism; we professors, it is said, are tainted with the general epidemic, and yet it is here that we use up our health; it is here that we wear ourselves out. I do not complain of it; our life belongs to you; we owe it to you to our last breath, and you shall have it. For my part, if I die, it will be in your service.” He said truly; this last effort killed him (p. 363).

What remains is soon told. Ozanam went to Eaux Bonnes, and into Spain, and finally into Italy. We follow him to

Pisa, Genoa, Sienna, Antignano, and finally to Marseilles and here came the end.

His arrival at Marseilles was quickly known, and the brotherhood of S. Vincent de Paul hastened to his door with every testimony of sorrow and respect. He was too ill to see any of them, but he was greatly touched to hear of their constant visits. Nothing could surpass the serenity that his soul now enjoyed; every trace of fear, of apprehension, had vanished; all bodily suffering had likewise ceased, and he appeared like one already dwelling in the sensible presence of God; he seldom spoke, but communed still with his beloved ones by a pressure of the hand, a sign, and that smile that lay like a halo on the wasted face, touching it already with the peace that passeth all understanding. Feeling that the end was near, he himself asked for the last Sacraments, and received them with great fervour and the liveliest consciousness. When all was over, his brother, remembering how keenly he had feared the Divine judgments, urged him gently to have confidence in the great mercy of God; but Ozanam, as if he understood not the allusion, answered, with a look of sweet surprise, "Why should I fear Him? I love Him so much!" On the evening of the 8th of September, the Feast of our Lady's Nativity, the summons came. His wife was beside him, and his brothers, and a few near relatives. The adjoining room was crowded with those other brothers, the members of the Society of S. Vincent de Paul, who knelt in silence, joining in the prayers that were speeding their founder into the presence of his Judge. He had fallen into a gentle slumber, waking up at intervals to murmur a blessing, a word of love, an invocation. Suddenly, opening his dark eyes in a wide, startled gaze, he lifted up his hands, and cried out in a loud voice, "My God! my God! have mercy on me." They were his last words (pp. 453, 454).

We have thus briefly traced the dates of time in order to show in how few years a great life was lived. Ozanam's studies were completed by the age of twenty-two; and in eighteen years he accomplished all that he has left behind of finished writings, and all that he wrought into the hearts and lives of the youth of France in the widespread revival of Faith, which is expanding to this day. They were eighteen years of great intellectual and spiritual intensity. One word spoken by a mind raised to the pitch of its powers does more than a thousand scattered from an unimpassioned mind. We have rarely seen clearer evidence of mental intensity than in Frederic Ozanam. It may be well believed that it was not only the energy of a mind inflamed with the love of God, but that the keen energy of a nervous system which daily consumed itself added to the intensity of the will. There can be no doubt that he accomplished the vow of his youth by spending and being spent to the last beat of his pulse for "the Truth which had given him peace."

A kindly critic the other day closed a notice of his biography with the words, "Dying at the age of 40, he left behind him a brilliant and a beautiful memory."

To estimate either the character or the works of Frederic Ozanam would require more than one article. The copious and sympathetic biography before us brings out many beautiful traits of the filial tenderness and veneration he bore to his mother, which may always be taken as the sure test of a manly and Christian heart. He had great cause to love her, for it was her fervent piety that formed his character from his earliest consciousness. He fully understood this inestimable blessing. Just after her death he writes:—

Alas! what havoc this death has made in my mind, as well as in my heart! No, I am wrong: what so crushed me was the long illness that I beheld day by day destroying her, and which—shall I say it?—seemed as if it were going to dishonour the sacrifice before consuming it, by quenching the intellectual faculties, and blunting the moral feelings; this thought was horrible and haunted me constantly; I seemed to see her soul dying with her body! Mercifully the trial was shortened; just at the end the energy of her soul revived, and Christ, in descending into the heart of His beloved servant, left there strength for the supreme struggle. She remained for three days, calm, serene, murmuring prayers, or acknowledging our caresses and services by a few words of ineffable sweetness. At last the fatal night came; it was I who was watching; I suggested to my dear mother the acts of faith, hope, and charity, the same that she had taught me to lip after her as a little child (p. 161).

Happy the man to whom God gives a holy mother! This dear memory will never forsake us. Often in my solitude now, in the midst of the anguish that weighs down my soul, the remembrance of that august scene returns to sustain and uplift me. I think of how short life is, how soon we shall be reunited with those from whom death has parted us, and then I feel all temptations of self-love, all the unworthy instincts of my nature, fade away, and my desires are concentrated in the single one of dying like my mother! Oh, how I rejoice now that I did not abandon that blessed deathbed to run after the vague promises of university honours! If at this trifling sacrifice I should only have earned the privilege of passing a few more months near her, of being there on that last night, I am more than paid for it (p. 162).

And two years after her death, when less loving and sensitive natures would have lost the vividness of their perceptions, he wrote:—

Nothing is so appalling as the growing solitude, the void that death creates around us. I have gone through it all; but this state did not last long. Then followed quickly another, when I began to feel that I was not alone, when I was conscious of something infinitely sweet in the depths of my soul; it was like an assurance that I had not been left alone; it was a

benign though invisible neighbourhood ; it was as if a cherished soul, passing close by, touched me with its wings. And, just as formerly, I used to recognize the step, the voice, the breath of my mother, so now, when a fresh breeze revived my strength, when a virtuous thought entered my mind, when a salutary impulse stirred my will, I could not but think it was still my mother. After a lapse of two years, when time might have dispelled what was merely the effect of an over-wrought imagination, I still experience the same thing. There are moments when a sudden thrill passes through me, as if she were there by my side ; above all, when I most stand in need of it, there are hours of maternal and filial intercourse, and then I shed more abundant tears, perhaps, than in the first months of my bereavement, but an ineffable peace is mingled with their sadness. When I am good, when I have done anything for the poor, whom she loved so tenderly, when I am at peace with God, whom she served so well, I see her smiling on me in the distance. Sometimes, when I am praying, I fancy I hear her voice praying with me, as we used to do together at the foot of the crucifix every night (p. 163).

The same tenderness of heart is visible in his friendships. His letters to M. Falconnet, and his grief at the death of a mutual friend, breathe an affection which can be found only in those who have grown up in the full play of filial and brotherly love. The same also is to be seen in all the notices of his domestic life. At the age of 28 he married Mdlle. Soulacroix, daughter of the Rector of the Academy. She was in every way a worthy companion of his gentle and ardent mind. Her intelligence appreciated his intellectual culture and aspirations ; and she had elevation of soul to second him in enterprises in which self gives way to duty. In 1848, when the barricades were in the streets of Paris, Ozanam was under arms in the National Guard. "Personally," says the biography, "he did not know what fear was. This courage was shared by his wife. 'Thank God ! Amélie is courageous,' he says to more than one friend, whom he keeps informed of their position during the outbreak ; and he constantly congratulates himself on finding a support instead of a hindrance in her presence throughout" (pp. 312, 313).

The same love and largeness of heart pervades his writings and his life whensoever he speaks of the poor. But this will fall more naturally into its place when we come to speak of his politics, or rather of his efforts as a social reformer in their behalf.

It is impossible for us to give any adequate representation of Ozanam's literary works. For eighteen years, distracted by the state of France both before and after the revolution of 1848, with health always frail, and for the last five years sen-

sibly giving way, it is wonderful how Ozanam could have accomplished so much. The amount of writing contributed by him to the "Tribune Catholique," the "Ere Nouvelle," the "Moniteur Religieux," journals which were striving to rally the youth of France to the Catholic reaction against infidelity, or to stir up charity and zeal for the amelioration of the poor, must have demanded the time, and thought, and energy of any ordinary man. But with him these accessory writings never suspended his serious and systematic literary work. Even his journeys for health and rest gave rise to one or more volumes. His journey to Italy produced "Les Poètes Franciscans," and his short excursion into Spain "A Pilgrimage to the Land of the Cid."

He had formed for himself an outline of a work to which he purposed to devote his life, "A History of Civilization among the Germans." He has left a record of what he intended to demonstrate in the following passage in a letter to M. Lallier :—

It was only at the close of my lectures that the serious interest of the subject revealed itself to me distinctly. It is a case of proving that Germany owes her genius and her whole civilization to the Christian education she received ; that her greatness was in proportion to her union with Christendom ; that she drew her power, her light, her poetry from her fraternal connections with the other nations of Europe ; that for her, as for others, there is, there can be no real destiny except through Roman unity, the depository of the temporal traditions of humanity, as well as of the eternal designs of Providence. All this looks simple, natural, almost trivial in its self-evident truth this side of the Rhine ; but, on the other hand, the national pride plumes itself in dreams of an autochthonous civilization from which Christianity has, by the way, caused them to decline ; in a literature which, without contact with the Latin, would have developed into unexampled splendour ; in a future, in fact, which promises to be magnificent, provided it steeps itself in unmixt and unalloyed Teutonism. The German type is no longer Charlemagne, but Arminius. These doctrines pierce in divers forms through the various philosophical, historical, and literary schools, from Hegel to Goethe, from Goethe to Strauss. It seems to me advisable to attack them at home, on their own ground ; to show how *alone* they were simply barbarians ; how, thanks to their bishops, their monks, to the Roman faith, the Roman language, the Roman law, they entered into possession of the religious, scientific, and political inheritance of modern nations ; how, in repudiating it, they fell back gradually into barbarism. An introduction which will precede, and conclusions that will follow the history of the literature of German chivalry, the principal object of my task, will, I hope, bring out this idea in strong relief (pp. 205, 206).

Of this work two volumes exist, of which Montalembert says, in a letter to Madame Ozanam, after her husband's

death, "I have a volume of the *"Etudes Germaniques"* always open before me." The best known of Ozanam's works is probably *"Dantè et la Philosophie Catholique au Treizième Siècle,"* in which the full beauty of his mind and all the tenderness of his fervent faith were especially manifest. During the greater part of his career he would not allow his lectures at the Sorbonne to be taken down. It was not until the year 1846 that he consented. They were found to be so fit for publication that he regretted, as we must also regret, that he had not consented sooner. This has given to us two volumes called *"La Civilization au Cinquième Siècle."* To this, his last work, he prefixed an Introduction, which gives the outline of the work to which he proposed to give himself for life. He says:—

I purpose writing the literary history of the Middle Ages, from the fifth century to the close of the thirteenth, up to Dante, where I shall stop as at the point most worthy of representing that great epoch. But in the history of letters I shall make civilization, of which they are the flower, my chief study, and in civilization I recognize the chief work of Christianity. . . . As a layman I have no mission to deal with theological subjects, and God, moreover, who loves to be served by the eloquence of man, finds plenty in our day to vindicate our dogmas. But while Catholics were absorbed with the defence of doctrine, the unbelieving seized upon history. They laid hands upon the Middle Ages, they sat in judgment upon the Church, judging her sometimes with enmity, sometimes with the respect due to a fine ruin, often with a levity they would not have used in treating profane subjects. We must reconquer this territory, which belongs to us, since we find it cleared by the hands of our monks, our Benedictines, and our Bollandists,—those men who did not think their life ill spent in growing pale over parchments and legends. Gibbon, the historian, went to visit Rome in his youth. One day, while wandering through the Capitol, the sound of hymns broke suddenly on his ear; he saw the doors of the basilica of the *Ara Cœli* open, and a long procession of Franciscan monks come forth, brushing with their sandals the pavement traversed by so many triumphs. It was then that indignation inspired him; he formed the design of avenging antiquity, outraged by Christian barbarism; he conceived the plan of the *"Decline of the Roman Empire."* And I, too, have beheld the monks of *Ara Cœli* treading on the venerable pavement of Jupiter Capitolinus; I saw it, and I rejoiced at the victory of love over strength, and I resolved to write the history of the progress of that period where the English philosopher saw nothing but decay; the history of civilization in the barbarous ages, the history of the human mind escaping from the shipwreck of the empire of letters, and traversing the flood of the invasions, as the Hebrews crossed the Red Sea, and under the same guidance: *"forti tegente brachio."* I know nothing more supernatural, nothing that proves more clearly the divinity of Christianity than to have saved the human mind (pp. 382-384).

Although Ozanam chose literature for his calling in life, and although he refused again and again the proposal to enter the Legislature, or to be called a politician, and that, too, with a declared purpose of working out social reforms in distinction from political, nevertheless he avowed himself explicitly to be a republican. This we have no doubt has caused him to incur the censure of Legitimists, Royalists, Imperialists, and even to lose the perfect confidence of loyal Catholics, who associate order and obedience with monarchy, and if not anarchy at least instability of both public and private morals with republicanism. This was especially true in France, where the name of Republic and the reality were identified with 1793 and the Phrygian cap of revolution. We shall not be suspected of republicanism, and our loyalty to the great English monarchy of a thousand years, founded broad and deep in the natural order of prudence and justice by our Catholic forefathers, and subsisting to this day, the only commonwealth against which revolutions have broken themselves in vain,—we say we shall not be suspected of republicanism, or of any uncatholic tendency in politics, if we clear Frederic Ozanam also from any such suspicion.

We have heard it said that no republican can be a good Catholic. We would commend this dictum to the conscience of Cardinal MacCloskey and to the pastors and people of the Catholic Church of the United States; or, to come nearer home, we would commend it to the deliberation of Mgr. Mermillod, who would, we imagine, distinguish between the Helvetican republic and the gang of infidels and persecutors who now tyrannize over Geneva. But we may even go further, and remind those who censure Ozanam's politics, of the republics of Venice, Florence, Pisa, and Genoa, of the Catholic chivalry which issued from them, and of the Saints who sprung from them.

Now it was precisely the medieval Christian and Catholic republic which fascinated and filled Ozanam's mind. In it he saw the check and balance which would have saved France from the excesses of its later kings, and, therefore, from the sanguinary and anarchical reaction called the Revolution. His indignant lamentations over the state of the people of Paris; his burning zeal for the poor, whose degradation in poverty, ignorance, and depravity, he as a Brother of S. Vincent of Paul, saw with his own eyes, and relieved with his own hands—all this made him pray and toil for a Christian equality of brotherhood such as he had read in the commonwealth of Israel. Perhaps the instinct of a theocratic

commonwealth ran in the blood of a Hozannam by direct inheritance.

But we can find for Ozanam another plea. In the years when he was entering into the studies of his manhood there appeared in France a book which has, more than almost any other, moulded and directed the political thought of the nineteenth century; we mean De Tocqueville's "*Democracy in America*."* We shall better convey our own meaning by simply letting De Tocqueville express his. In his Introduction to his work he writes as follows :—

The more I studied American society, the more I perceived that the equality of conditions is the fundamental fact from which all others seem to be derived, and the central point at which all my observations constantly terminated. I then turned my thoughts to our own hemisphere, where I imagined that I discerned something analogous to the spectacle which the New World presented to me. I observed that the equality of conditions is daily progressing towards those extreme limits which it seems to have reached in the United States; and that the democracy which governs the American communities appears to be rapidly rising into power in Europe (p. xiii.).

He ascribes this equality chiefly to the action of the Catholic Church :—

Soon (he says) the political power of the clergy was founded, and began to exert itself; the clergy opened its ranks to all classes,—to the poor and to the rich, the villain and the lord; equality penetrated into the government through the Church, and the being who, as a serf, must have vegetated in perpetual bondage, took his place as a priest in the midst of nobles, and not unfrequently above the heads of kings (p. xv.).

After saying that every fifty years has levelled France more and more nearly after the model of America, he says :—

Nor is this phenomenon at all peculiar to France. Whithersoever we turn our eyes, we shall witness the same continual revolution throughout the whole of Christendom. The various occurrences of national existence have everywhere turned to the advantage of democracy. All men have aided it by their exertions: those who have intentionally laboured in its cause, and those who have served it unwittingly; those who have fought for it, and those who have declared themselves its opponents,—have all been driven along in the same track, have all laboured to one end, some ignorantly and some unwillingly; all have been blind instruments in the hands of God. The gradual development of the equality of conditions is therefore a providential fact, and it possesses all the characteristics of a Divine decree: it is universal, it is durable, it constantly eludes all human interference, and all events as well as all men contribute to its progress (pp. xix. xx.).

* "*Democracy in America*": Reeves's translation. London: 1865.

The whole book which is here offered to the public has been written under the impression of a kind of religious dread produced on the author's mind by the contemplation of so irresistible a revolution, which has advanced for centuries in spite of such amazing obstacles, and which is still proceeding in the midst of the ruins it has made (p. xxi.).

The Christian nations of our age seem to me to present a most alarming spectacle ; the impulse which is bearing them along is so strong that it cannot be stopped, but it is not yet so rapid that it cannot be guided : their fate is in their hands ; yet a little while and it may be so no longer. The first duty which is at this time imposed upon those who direct our affairs is to educate the democracy : to warm its faith, if that be possible ; to purify its morals ; to direct its energies ; to substitute a knowledge of business for its inexperience, and an acquaintance with its true interests for its blind propensities ; to adapt its government to time and place, and to modify it in compliance with the occurrences and the actors of the age. A new science of politics is indispensable to a new world (p. xxii.).

Zealous Christians may be found amongst us, whose minds are nurtured in the love and knowledge of a future life, and who readily espouse the cause of human liberty, as the source of all moral greatness. Christianity, which has declared that all men are equal in the sight of God, will not refuse to acknowledge that all citizens are equal in the sight of the law. But, by a singular concurrence of events, religion is entangled in those institutions which democracy assails, and it is not unfrequently brought to reject the equality it loves, and to curse that cause of liberty as a foe, which it might hallow by its alliance (pp. xxxi. xxxii.).

He then sums up the saddest feature of our times—the unnatural and fratricidal conflicts of those who have common interests, and are combining for the same ends. It is as if *Até* had come between men.

The religionists are the enemies of liberty, and the friends of liberty attack religion ; the high-minded and the noble advocate subjection, and the meanest and most servile minds preach independence ; honest and enlightened citizens are opposed to all progress, whilst men without patriotism and without principles are the apostles of civilization and of intelligence (pp. xxxiii. xxxiv.).

We cannot leave De Tocqueville's name without adding that he was born of a fervent Catholic Breton family ; that, like too many Frenchmen, he became practically indifferent ; but that he ended his days at Cannes with the pastoral care of the curé and the watchful service of a sister of charity.

Now, we can hardly believe that Ozanam had not become familiar with De Tocqueville's thesis, and we might venture to assert with De Tocqueville's writings. If so, we have the key to the passages which we now add, in which Ozanam pours out his whole political creed.

His biographer, who evidently has studied all his works, has summed up his mind as follows :—

The philosophy of history, as he interpreted it, had led him to believe that there is no real meaning or character in the movement of human society unless through all its changes and convulsions we can discern a steady and continual progress through Christianity to the dignity of freedom. This condition of freedom, which he held as essential to the welfare and happiness of communities, he considered equally indispensable to the Church. He was consequently intolerant of the least bondage for her, and impatient that a Christian people should tolerate it, when at the same time they were, perhaps, fighting manfully for the emancipation of their country. If the Church were free, free in the fullest sense of the word,—free to guide, to rule, and to teach mankind,—then all legitimate freedom would follow (pp. 272, 273).

"A struggle is preparing," he says, "between the classes, and it threatens to be terrible; let us precipitate ourselves between these hostile ranks, so as to deaden the shock, if we cannot prevent it." In 1836 he wrote to his friend Lallier :—"The question which agitates the world to-day, is not a question of *political forms*, but a *social* question; if it be the struggle of those who have nothing, with those who have too much; if it be the violent shock of opulence and poverty which is making the ground tremble under our feet, our duty, as Christians, is to throw ourselves between these irreconcilable enemies, and to induce one side to give, in order to fulfil the law, and the other to receive, as a benefit; to make one side cease to exact, and the other to refuse; to render equality as general as it is possible amongst men; to make voluntary community of possession replace taxation and forced loans; to make charity accomplish what justice and law alone can never do." He adhered to this political creed all his life. Twelve years later, on the eve of the "violent shock" which his far-seeing sagacity foretold, he repeats, as in his student days, "It is a social question; do away with misery, Christianize the people, and you will make an end of revolutions" (pp. 294, 295).

"The first duty of Christians, now, is not to be frightened; and the second is not to frighten others; but, on the contrary, to reassure the timorous, and to make them understand that the present crisis is like a storm that cannot last" (p. 308).

"Here we are in this great and opulent metropolis for the last seven weeks without a government or a regular police force, and yet we hear of no more murders, robberies, or other misdemeanours than before. Don't believe those evil-minded persons who go about spreading absurd stories; there is not a word of truth in them, and nothing is more contrary to the dispositions of the population of Paris, who on every occasion seek to show respect to religion and sympathy to the clergy. My friend, the Abbé Cherduel, who has blessed thirteen trees of liberty, has been quite affected by the proofs of faith which he found amidst this people, where, since 1815, the priest has been taught to see only enemies of God and of the Church. Occupy yourself as much with servants as with masters, with workmen as much as with

employers. This is henceforth the *only* means of salvation for the Church of France. The curés must set aside their pious parish congregations, little flocks of good sheep in the midst of an enormous population to whom the parish priest is a stranger. He must henceforth occupy himself, not only with the indigent, but with that immense class of poor who do not ask for alms, but who are, nevertheless, attracted by special preaching, by charitable associations, by the affection that is shown to them, and which teaches them more than we think. Now, more than ever, we ought to meditate on a beautiful passage in the 2nd chapter of the Epistle of S. James, which seems as if it had been written expressly for these times" (pp. 308, 309).

Once more, in a passage which we reluctantly abridge, he brings out the profound conviction of his mind that the infidel revolution is the ranting and malaria of a land where the "salt has lost its savour:—

"It is within, not without, that we must seek for the sources of men's happiness and its principal enemies," he declares; "and we shall have done nothing, absolutely nothing, so long as we have not carried light and reform into those internal disorders which time does not right, which are more incurable than diseases, which last longer than the *chômage*, and go on multiplying pauperism long after the grass of the graveyard has effaced the last traces of civil war. God did not make the poor; He sends no human creatures into the chances of this world without providing them with those two sources of riches, which are the fountain of all others—intelligence and will. . . . Why should we hide from the people what they know, and flatter them like bad kings? It is human liberty that makes the poor; it is it that dries up those two primitive fountains of wealth, by allowing intelligence to be quenched in ignorance, and will to be weakened by misconduct. The working men know it better than we do. . . . God forbid that we should calumniate the poor whom the Gospel blesses, or render the suffering classes responsible for their misery; thus pandering to the hardness of those bad hearts that fancy themselves exonerated from helping the poor man when they have proved his wrong-doing. . . . But while we have put crushing taxes on salt, meat, and all necessities of life, we have not yet discovered in the arsenal of our fiscal laws the secret of arresting the multiplication of distilleries, of raising the price of alcoholic liquors, of restricting the sale of those detestable, adulterated, poisonous drinks that cause more sickness than all the rigours of the seasons, and make more criminals than all the injustice of men combined. What reforms have you introduced into the public amusements of this Parisian population, so infatuated about pleasure, so ready to let itself be led to the ends of the earth, not with bread, as it has been said, but with amusement. Last winter the Prefecture of Police delivered *four thousand licenses for night balls*. The State puts no limit to those unhealthy diversions, which the good sense of our fathers contracted within the six weeks of the Carnival. Every year it authorises the opening of a new theatre in some wretched haunt of the Faubourgs, where the sons and daughters of the people are fed nightly upon the scum of a literature whose cynicism

would revolt the chastity of the opera pit. And when, for six months of the year, the youth of the working classes have spent their evenings and their nights in these horrible dens, where their health runs as much danger as their morals, you are surprised to see them turn out miserable, puny creatures, incapable of supplying the military contingent, but supplying innumerable recruits every year to the prisons and the hospitals ! Let us not imagine we have done our duty by the people when we have taught them to read and write, and count. . . . When it was a question of crushing out the last embers of the insurrection, there was no need of delays and formalities to pitch twenty camps in the Boulevards of Paris, and up to the very doors of the Hôtel de Ville ; and here we are, after four months, when in the 12th arrondissement alone there are 4,000 children without shelter—here we are still struggling amidst adjournments, motions, and debates, fighting to overcome I know not what scruples of committees, boards, administrations, and the rest of it, who are terrified that the State will be ruined and overturned if the education of the young *ouvriers* is confided to sisters and brothers, to teachers capable, that is, of teaching them something more than how to spell out the syllables of the newspaper, and to scrawl the *ordre de jour* of the barricades on the walls with a piece of coal" (pp. 323—325).

"The poor devils," he said, "who are beguiled to the barricades, but who are Christians at heart, are ready to melt at a word of kindness" (p. 267).

In all this we see a profound faith in the words of the Holy Scriptures. "*Sanabiles fecit Deus nationes super terras.*" He believed the nations to be sick because their faith had almost given way under the spiritual, moral, and physical conditions of their life. But he profoundly believed in the healing power of God through the Church and the ever-renewing health of the generations of man. France, it is said, had once two-and-twenty thousand leprosy hospitals, but they have disappeared together with the leprosy which called them into existence. So he believed that the social evils of France were to be healed by the power of Christianity upon the heart of man. "Christianize the masses": this was his gospel and his political creed—a creed which has a higher sanction from S. Gregory the Great to Pius the Ninth.

And the mention of this august name reminds us that we cannot better close this hearty tribute to a beautiful mind and a noble life than by the words in which Ozanam professed his filial and loving obedience to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The winter of 1846–1847 Ozanam passed in Rome. It was at the beginning of the Pontificate of Pius IX. On Easter Sunday he wrote thus :—

"This is the moment to speak to you of the Papacy, now that I have just assisted at its most solemn pageants, and am still under the spell of the emotion called up by that most thrilling spectacle which is to be seen on earth, the Papal Mass and the benediction of the *Urbi et orbi*" (p. 255).

Ozanam was received by the Holy Father with the most fatherly affection, and it was returned by a filial love which inspired his whole soul with the loyalty of a chivalrous Catholic. He says, speaking of the Holy Father:—

‘ He has resumed, one by one, all the active functions of the episcopacy—preaching, giving confirmation, visiting *incognito* schools and hospitals and the poor in their garrets, going to say mass in any obscure chapel, and distributing communion to all who are present, as my wife and I had the happiness of receiving it from him. And with all this, a purity of life that was the admiration of those who knew him as a young priest, and a charity so boundless that when he set out to come to the conclave he was obliged to borrow six hundred crowns for his journey. . . . But what strikes one above everything else in him are those two sentiments that have made the greatness of all great Popes,—an immovable faith in the Divine authority vested in him, and a profound conviction of his unworthiness; a trust in God that enables him to undertake everything, and a contempt for himself that enables him to suffer everything; hence the *aureola* of sanctity which illuminates his countenance, and that burning accent which pervades his discourse ” (p. 259).

At a public meeting, on his return from Rome, he said:—

“ I believe the future has serious troubles in store for Pius IX. I believe it for his greater glory. God does not raise up such men for ordinary difficulties. If this great Pontiff had only to cope with the over-enthusiasm, the eagerness of his people—a thing that so few princes have to complain of—his mission would be an easy one; it would fill too small a place in history; his bark would glide over tranquil waters. We must look out for the tempest. But let us not fear, like the disciples of little faith; Christ is in the boat, and He is not sleeping; never has He been more wakeful than in these present days ” (pp. 269, 270).

Such was Frederic Ozanam, a pure and noble soul, on fire with charity to all men, especially to the poor; consumed by zeal in the service of truth; pious, with a filial tenderness; exemplary in every path of life; more eloquent in the supernatural beauty of his thoughts than in the loving words which fell from his lips; more illuminated with the ardour of Christian faith than with the manifold lights of literary cultivation: such a man bore in him a Catholic heart full of all instinctive loyalty, as ready to give his life for a jot or tittle of the faith, or for a definition of the Divine authority of the Church, as he was to counsel the Archbishop of Paris to tread in the steps of the Good Shepherd, and to lay down his life for his sheep. May God raise up on every side laymen like Frederic Ozanam.

ART. III.—F. COLERIDGE'S LIFE OF OUR LIFE.

The Life of our Life. By H. J. COLERIDGE, S. J. London : Burns & Oates.

The New Testament Narrative in the words of the Sacred Writers. Translated according to the Vulgate. London : Burns & Oates.

IT happens not unfrequently in the history of the world, that some work, eminently needing to be done, is placed (one may say) by the force of events, in the hands of some one eminently fitted to do it. We cannot but recognize something of this kind, as regards the circumstances which have engaged F. Coleridge in his labour of love on the Gospels. And in explaining why the work on which he is employed is to our mind one so eminently needed to be done—before we develop those considerations on which we should lay special stress—we will begin by mentioning one benefit derivable from it, which is subordinate indeed, but very far from unimportant.

Those irreligious writers, who occupy so large a place in the speculative activity of this day, have two objects especially dear to them. They desire to discredit the cognisableness of God, and (consistently with this aim) they desire to discredit the divine mission of Jesus Christ. In prosecuting the latter enterprise, their one principal weapon is to disparage in every possible way the trustworthiness of the Gospel narratives. We have argued on previous occasions that, even were the trustworthiness of the Gospels demonstrably disproved, such disproof would not even tend to impair the irrefragable evidence which exists for the truth of our Lord's Resurrection ; evidence founded on those Epistles of S. Paul which every infidel admits to be genuine, and on those historical facts which every infidel admits to be true. And there is no one whosoever, we suppose, who will admit the truth of our Lord's Resurrection, and at the same time doubt His divine mission. Still the Christian controversy against infidelity and misbelief is, in ways too numerous to recount, momentarily reinforced, by placing in clear light the great authority reasonably claimed for the Gospels : claimed for them, we mean, even on historical or critical grounds, and apart from the Church's authority. Here then is one most important service, rendered by such a writer as F. Coleridge.

"The close acquaintance with 'each evangelist separately' (he says, p. lix.) "which the study of Harmony requires, seems to me to produce an ever-increasing accumulation of proof of the extraordinary accuracy of the Gospels; as well of their very great nearness to the events of which they speak." By no other reply to infidel assaults on the Gospels—numerous and powerful as such replies undoubtedly are—will the intellect and imagination of a sincere inquirer be so powerfully affected, as by the careful and conscientious study of such a work as that before us.

But it is not merely in the way of replying to objections, that this study will be invaluable. It has a much wider scope, as a prophylactic against modern misbelief:—

The Gospels are the inheritance of the Christian people in all ages, but an intelligent acquaintance with them would be a specially powerful protection against the sophistries and illusions of our own time. From the highest forms of Protestantism down to the lowest phases of opinion, hardly to be called Christianity, from the objections which are raised under the name of science and history to the most unsubstantial of subjective dreamings, theological error as well as sentimental wilfulness, universalism and immorality, as well as sectarian obstinacy—all popular forms of falsehood and deception drop off into dust before the true knowledge of our Lord (p. lx).

At last however such reasons as we have mentioned hold a comparatively subordinate place, among those which should stimulate every devout Christian who duly reflects on the case, to enter with keenest zest on a systematic study of the Gospels. Let it be once understood that it is the very acts and words of Almighty God which are therein placed before the believer for his meditation—and all other intellectual studies shrink in some sense into comparative insignificance. God, by an act of mercy which might well have been thought incredible, has not only vouchsafed to clothe Himself in human nature and visit this earth, but to authenticate certain unspeakably precious records of what He did and said.* The only reasonable response to this mercy is, that all those who are capable of doing so should give a most prominent place in their intellectual life to a study of those records. Right-minded Christians, who are capable of such investigation, may or may not think it worth while to master profoundly and accurately this or that branch of secular history, ancient or modern; but there is one history at all events (one would think) on which they will eagerly lavish the richest resources of their

* We pointed out the distinction between these two separate mercies, in our review of *F. Coleridge* in July, 1875, pp. 173—5.

intellect: viz. the human history of God the Son. Above every other series of facts which ever took place on this globe, they will labour to apprehend the full significance of all which He did and said; of all which others did and said to Him. They will strive to realize in detail every scene of which He was a part; to discover the thread which may connect one group of His words and acts with another; to understand the characteristic features exhibited by each successive period of His life. Those who hold as a dogma of the Faith that the Agent and Speaker of those acts and words is Almighty God, might be expected (one would think) to be separated from all others by no one more manifest and conspicuous specialty, than by their prominent and intense devotion to such a study as we have mentioned.

Unhappily the fact differs widely from what might reasonably be expected. It is not merely that those less devout Catholics, whose interest largely centres in worldly affairs, are lukewarm on the matter: this is intelligible enough. But a large proportion (it would seem) of devout and interior persons—persons at the same time whose intellectual endowments would well qualify them for the study in question—seem to find in it but little interest. We have no wish to exaggerate the evil. A certain portion of the Gospels, comparatively indeed small in extent but unspeakably the most precious of all—we mean the narratives of the Passion—are meditated on with keenest devotion by all pious souls: though even this meditation would perhaps bear still richer fruit, with those who make an immediate study and harmony of the Gospel text. Again we by no means forget the circumstance, that the great majority of meditation books are based almost entirely on different facts of our Lord's life; and God forbid we should undervalue the immense benefits thence in every way resulting. Still such meditations—we hope it may not appear invidious to say so—by no means (so far as we can see) supply the desideratum on which we are insisting. In the first place many Catholics, who might pursue a study of the Gospels with most happy results, are not called to the habit of formal and methodical daily meditation. But further and more importantly, there is a great difference to be noted. Whatever individual mystery of our Lord's life may on any given day be the theme of meditation in one of these books, is not commonly considered at all in reference to other acts and words of our Lord, or to its place in His consecutive history; nor again in that fulness of meaning, which the inspired words recording it may contain. Rather it is contemplated, as it stands out on the surface and as an isolated

fact. Very commonly indeed much the larger part of the meditation is occupied with deducing almost arbitrarily, from the proposed mystery, this or that lesson—doubtless most holy lesson—for practical life: some lesson which does not at all tend to place our Lord's act or word more vividly and energetically before the mind.* We are very far of course from implying, that the method adopted in meditation books is not the best for obtaining the end aimed at in meditation. On the contrary our argument is strengthened, so far as we admit this. We say that the fruits, derivable from methodically studying our Lord's life, are by no means obtained by merely using one of the many meditation books founded on the successive facts of that life. And this statement only becomes more probable in proportion as it is admitted, that the purpose aimed at in meditation is not precisely the same as the purpose aimed at in this particular study.

It would carry us quite too far—though otherwise it would be by no means an unprofitable consideration—if we speculated on the various causes that may have led to the undesirable result which we lament. But what we have said will make our readers the better understand, why it is that we have expressed ourselves more than once in terms of such intense sympathy with F. Coleridge's enterprise. Even had its execution been less masterly than it is, Catholics would owe him a large debt of gratitude for its conception. In the treatment of his theme as a whole, he purports (if we rightly understand him) to rest his foundation on "all that the evangelists in their narratives, or the Church in her theology, in her history and her devotion, place within our reach, of a kind that can illustrate the Economy of the Incarnation" (i. 15). He then further purports to build a superstructure on that foundation, through help of every resource which has been furnished, whether by the pious contemplation of Catholic ascetics,—or by the labours of Catholic commentators,—or by that specially important fact the growth of modern criticism,—or by the valuable data which abound in modern books of travel as to the religious opinions, the domestic habits, the political condition, the physical circumstances of contemporary Palestine—or in one word by every possible instrument within his

* Last July, when criticising an earlier volume of F. Coleridge's, we hinted at a similar distinction to that mentioned in the text. "It is easy enough doubtless," we said, "to make our Lord's words texts as it were to a series of sermons: but there is not a sentence of F. Coleridge's which can fairly be called digressive; not a sentence which does not assist in apprehending more fully and precisely what it is which our Blessed Lord is saying" (p. 237).

reach. As the result of this widely-extended and arduous labour, he aims at achieving a result, which would far more than repay any imaginable amount of such labour. He proposes to take his readers as it were by the hand, and lead them to contemplate our Lord's recorded acts and words as living and breathing facts; to apprehend them moreover, not only as they are in themselves, but in their mutual interdependence and connection. And we say confidently that even if F. Coleridge's actual achievements in the field he has chosen were less signal than they most certainly are—he would still have rendered a service of momentous importance, by urgently calling the attention of Catholics to the existence and great productiveness of that field.

On former occasions we have expressed our humble judgment, in regard to the three volumes on our Lord's "public life" which have successively appeared. Over and above the immense value of his ideal, we consider that he has wrought *towards* that ideal with signal success. But the very completeness with which he has done his work brings with it an incidental disadvantage. It is no doubt a most important study to contemplate our Lord's acts and words one by one: but it is no less important to contemplate His life *as a whole*; the organic connection of one part with another; the special characteristics of its each successive period. Now F. Coleridge's exposition of the Gospel text is so complete and full, that had he continued simply on his original plan, it is impossible to say for how long a period this *second* part of his subject would have had to be deferred. We think therefore (as we said in January) that he has been excellently advised, in breaking through the continuousness of his course, by at once setting forth his reasoned view of our Lord's history as a whole. This cannot of course as yet be done by any means so thoroughly, as will be possible when his detailed exposition of the Gospels shall have come to an end. We may add that the present volumes would in many passages be more intelligible as to their arrangement, if they could have been preceded or accompanied by a more full and minute examination of each Gospel severally than has been possible in the Preface. Something of this kind has been done in some articles which F. Coleridge has contributed to the "Month" on the structure of S. Matthew: but each Evangelist requires separate and similar treatment. Still, after every reasonable deduction, it remains true that the invaluable materials, which F. Coleridge has collected during years of patient labour and thought, can *at once* with extreme usefulness be exhibited in their general character and bearing. The three volumes

already published on "the public life of Jesus" have sufficiently shown, on what principle F. Coleridge would deal with our Lord's acts and words *individually*: but it was still needed that his readers should understand, how he would deal with the assemblage of those words and acts *as a whole*.

Now to set forth this, is simply in other words to construct *a harmony*. The study of our Lord's life is invested on one hand with quite peculiar attractiveness, but, on the other hand also with quite peculiar difficulty, by the character of the primary sources from which it is derived. Those sources (we need not say) are four distinct compositions, written each with its own peculiar purpose; each with its own inimitable beauty and unity; no one of which expresses its author's knowledge of other equally authoritative compositions, nor (still less, of course), any account of his own intended *relation* to those compositions. Among many most striking coincidences between these compositions, there are not so very few details in them which on the surface seem mutually contradictory: though the more carefully the Gospels are studied, the more unmistakable becomes the profound harmony and essential unity of them all.* The Catholic knows, of course, that there is no real contradiction, even the slightest, between these compositions; that they are divinely inspired; that every statement they contain is literally true, in the sense which the author intended. On the other hand "this Christian belief does not preclude the influence of other more natural elements in the case of the Evangelists. It does not shut out the individual character, or the personal experience, or the acquired knowledge, or the turn of mind, or the habit

* "The four Evangelists may not inaptly be compared to four artists seated at different points of view, yet all engaged on sketching the same magnificent building. No two of the sketches will be exactly alike, and yet, if all the artists are equally accurate, all will be true pictures of the building. Only those who are intimately acquainted with the building will be able to see clearly how the apparent differences are to be reconciled; and each sketch will have its own peculiar beauties, its own characteristics, arising from the special style of the artists and his particular point of view, and these peculiarities will have their own special value, quite apart from the reconciliation of the differences. So with the four inspired artists who have portrayed for us the Life of our Lord. The knowledge of the divine original, obtained by meditation and prayer, enables us to escape from the perplexities which thicken around the irreverent or sceptical student of Scripture. But it is not enough to escape being perplexed by the apparent discrepancies. We wish to note those differences, and reverently to seek out their cause, and in doing so new beauties of the glorious Original will open before us, and a new insight into the scope and intention of each sacred writer will give zest to our investigations."—From an admirable criticism of F. Coleridge in the "Tablet."

of thought, or the kind of education or association, or the methods of expression, the peculiar tastes or imagery, the natural and cultivated modesty or reserve or simplicity or picturesqueness, which might have distinguished the same authors if they had produced books which were merely human in every respect" (Preface, p. xvi.). But these pregnant principles being assumed, much still remains behind. We may take one or two obvious instances out of a large number, as to the *kind* of questions which have to be considered. Thus—what is the degree of accuracy with which the Evangelists purport to relate our Lord's discourses? It is plain that they did *not* purport to convey in every instance His "*ipsissima verba*"; because, even assuming that He spoke in Greek, there are verbal differences of a more or less minute kind, in the respective reports of what were indubitably identical discourses. Again—what authority is possessed by the *order* of the Gospels? In what cases, if in any, is it to be assumed that this was strictly chronological? And many other similar inquiries may be named, which must be answered one way or other, if the student is to grasp our Lord's life as a connected whole. For many years, F. Coleridge has given his mind carefully and perseveringly to such questions. So far as having mastered the literature of the subject goes, there can be no second opinion as to his eminent qualifications. A Catholic critic has most truly said, that "the thoughtful student will be surprised at the amount of learning and research so modestly concealed in those notes and prolegomena." But he has brought to his task other qualifications, even far more important than learning. Especially we may mention a certain reverential tact and sagacity—resulting, (one may think), on the one hand from long and minute meditation on the Gospel text, on the other hand from intellectual gifts of a very rare and choice order—which places his mind in exquisite harmony with the great facts treated by him, and gives indefinitely greater value to his decisions than could be claimed by mere erudition.

We need hardly say that, within the limits of an article, we can do no more than give brief samples of the way in which F. Coleridge treats his subject. But we will take such a case as the following, which, in some sense may be called critical: it is one which by no means rarely occurs, and which (as it happens) involves both the two questions above instanced. Two narrations, identical with each other in a great number of particulars though not in all, are found in two respective Evangelists: one recorded as though referring to one part of our Lord's life, and another to another. On what principle is

the harmony of these two narrations to be arranged? Shall they be referred to one event in our Lord's life or to two? F. Coleridge almost invariably gives the *latter* answer. The principle on which he does so is to our mind most undeniably true; and, if admitted, it throws a flood of light on the whole structure of the Gospels. The author states it as follows:—

One of the most dangerous rocks against which a Harmonist ought to be warned, is the supposition that it is at all unlikely that our Lord said and did the same things over and over again in different places during the course of His three years' Ministry. That supposition is in itself obviously and grossly unreasonable. No persons in the world, except perhaps the physicians, are so constantly in the habit of repeating their own words, answering questions and difficulties over and over again, giving the same directions and using the same illustrations and enforcing the same maxims, as those whose Apostolical calling lays upon them the happy but most laborious work of following the great Physician of souls in the exercises of His Missionary Life.

There is every possible reason for thinking that the discourses and actions of our Lord, especially His miracles, were very constantly the same almost in every feature. The same may be said of the opposition with which He was received, the objections made to His teaching, the cavils against His conduct, the calumnies against His Life. The effect of this consideration on the decisions which the Harmonist has to make is easily stated. He must be very much on his guard against the temptation to identify similar actions and anecdotes and sayings, in the face of even slight but decided indications of variety in the external circumstances. Such slight indications are generally the notes by which the Evangelists give us to understand that they are not speaking of the same occurrence (Preface, pp. xlvi.-xlviii.).

Indeed it is most certain that there is very close similarity between *acts* of our Lord, and not merely words or sayings, which are incontestably distinct: as in His miraculously feeding the multitude. F. Coleridge excellently observes (ii. 164), that "if one evangelist had related the feeding of the five thousand, and one other the feeding of the four thousand, certain critics would have declared that there was but one miracle, and that the Evangelists had been at fault as to the number of the people and the loaves."

On this principle our author explains the many resemblances, between the Sermon on the Mount recorded by S. Matthew, and the Sermon on the Plain recorded by S. Luke. And he signalizes an evil of no small magnitude, which results in this and other analogous cases, from identifying utterances of our Lord, which are in fact distinct. We italicise a few of his words, that our readers may specially observe their force and significance.

In the case of the supposition that the discourses were really two, we have our Lord Himself varying the expressions, and not only the expres-

sions, but in some instances the points of doctrine themselves which He puts forth to two different audiences. In each case we have what He said, and we have the additional lesson which is conveyed in the manner in which under different circumstances and at a different time He varied the points which He urged upon His hearers. In the other hypothesis we have the same discourse, but it is applied by the two several Evangelists (though they are still supposed to consider the audience and the occasion the same in our Lord's Life) to the readers to whom their two several Gospels are addressed. That is, instead of a sermon mainly the same, but preached by our Lord to different people and varied by His compassionate prudence according to what He knew of the needs of His several audiences, we have in fact *two versions or representations of the same words by different Evangelists for the purposes of their own readers*. In the one case the words are in both Sermons accurately reported, and *come straight from our Lord*; in the other *they are two different versions of the same words*, all the differences between which do not come from Him.

It will at all events be allowed that there should be some very good and urgent reason for our acceptance of a theory as to the reports of our Lord's words which would thus put us, as it were, at a *greater distance from Him* (Preface, pp. li, lii.).

The same fundamental principle of harmony is adopted in the little work, which we have named in company with F. Coleridge's at the head of our article: a work which, while unpretending in form, is evidently the fruit of mature learning and thought. As regards e.g. the sermons on the Mountain and the Plain, they are inserted as separate discourses in pp. 26 and 39 respectively.

At the same time F. Coleridge by no means pushes his principle to a violent and uncompromising extreme. Here is an instance of what we mean. S. Matthew inserts in the midst of the Galilean ministry (viii. 19—22) two incidents, mentioned by him in immediate succession: that of the scribe who sought to follow our Lord,—and of the disciple who asked first to go and bury his father, before joining the holy company. S. Luke (ix. 57—62) mentions these incidents successively in quite another part of his narrative; viz. where he speaks of our Lord as on His way towards Jerusalem. And he subjoins a third incident, similar in character to the two others, not mentioned by S. Matthew. F. Coleridge however does not consider, that the respective narrations of S. Matthew and S. Luke refer in fact to two different groups of events: but to one and the same. On this view, the first of these events certainly happened at the time to which S. Luke refers it; because he expressly says so (ix. 57). As to the second of the two, F. Coleridge inclines to think that it happened at the period to which it appertains in S. Matthew.

The reason for putting them together is obvious. Here we should have lost instead of gaining, by a strict adherence on the part of the Evangelists to the chronological order. It is only going a step further to suppose that the Evangelists thought that it was important that such words of our Lord should be preserved, but that in what particular connection they were inserted was unimportant. In S. Matthew they are placed where our Lord is going to pass over the lake, and we know that that voyage really took place after the first teaching by parables. In S. Luke they are placed at the outset of the period of which we are speaking, when our Lord was leaving Galilee. At either time it was natural that such applications should be made. If one were made at one time, and another at another, either Evangelist might suit his own arrangement by placing the two or the three together at either point (ii. 62, 63).

Our other author here takes a more stringent view, and recites S. Luke's three incidents as altogether distinct from S. Matthew's two. For ourselves, we cannot but think, with F. Coleridge, that this arrangement unnecessarily involves the narrative in serious difficulty.

On one harmonistic detail, we find ourselves in unwilling opposition to *both* our authors: we refer to the healing of the blind men near Jericho (Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43). And as this particular case is always placed in the very front ground by those who deny the entire accuracy of the Evangelists, it will perhaps be permissible to speak of it more at length. It seems to us then with very great deference, that F. Coleridge has not here met the precise difficulty. It is probable enough, as he says (ii. 166), "that two or two dozen blind men were sitting begging at or near the gates of Jericho, by which the pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem for the Pasch passed in or out of the city." What we find extremely hard of belief is, that—whereas the disciples on their road to Jericho had been in some sense reproved by our Lord for rebuking the blind man's clamour—they should so very soon afterwards repeat the very same offence; and that too under circumstances precisely similar, which must have forcibly reminded them of the previous event. Now we do not think that so harsh a supposition is at all necessitated by S. Luke's language.

We see no reason then whatever for assuming, that S. Luke intended his v. 38 to succeed immediately v. 37 in order of time. On one hand F. Coleridge himself admits, that there is an interval of forty days between Luke xxiv. vv. 43 and 44 (see ii. 435, 439): a fact which may surely be taken as exemplifying the Evangelist's occasional *modus loquendi*. And on the other hand (as we shall presently explain) S. Luke's words taken by themselves rather point to the inter-

pretation which we ourselves prefer. We suggest then (as so many commentators have substantially suggested, Maldonatus in their number) the following conjectural scene. The first blind man, sitting at the entrance of Jericho and hearing a multitude pass by, is told in answer to his inquiries that this is Jesus of Nazareth. On mastering this intelligence, he cries for help;* but by this time the crowd has swept on, and our Blessed Lord, Who sees the future, at this moment makes no response. On learning however that Jesus tarries for a brief space with Zaccheus, our blind man proceeds to join a fellow-sufferer, Bar-Timæus (Mark x. 46). He stations himself in his company where Bar-Timæus is in the habit of sitting at the exit of Jericho, and informs him Whom they are to expect. These are the two blind men of Matt. xx. 30. After some delay, Jesus approaches; the two cry aloud for aid; the front rank of the multitude rebuke them for their clamour; but Jesus calls them to Him and heals them.

We submit firstly, that this conjectural scene is in full harmony with everything which S. Luke says. But we submit secondly—as has been ingeniously urged by a Protestant critic—that in one respect it is *more* simply in harmony with S. Luke's language than is the other interpretation. For *who* is it, according to S. Luke, who rebuke the blind man? The *front-rank* of the crowd (v. 39). The blind man then was in *front* of the multitude which accompanied Jesus; and the cry for mercy therefore, which S. Luke records, cannot have been uttered while Jesus was in the very act of passing by. On the other hand it is surely natural enough, that S. Luke, having begun his narration of the anecdote, should prosecute it to its end before mentioning what happened in the interval.

It will have been observed, that we consider S. Luke to have been silent in ch. xviii. on the interval of time which elapsed between his v. 37 and v. 38. In like manner (as we have already urged) he undeniably preserves an equally profound silence on the interval of time which elapsed in his twenty-fourth chapter, either between vv. 43 and 44, or (as we prefer to think) vv. 45 and 46. But these are only isolated instances of a very large and pervasive fact: viz. the very remarkable *silences* of the Evangelists. Nothing e.g. can possibly be clearer—we should say with F. Coleridge—to those who carefully study S. John, than that he wrote as intending to supplement his predecessors: yet he is profoundly silent on this intention; while on the other hand those whom he supplements are equally silent, as to there being such gaps in the

* We do not refer to *this* cry as the one of v. 38.

narrative as those which he fills up. Going to another matter—no Christian can possibly suppose that S. Luke was ignorant of the great post-Resurrection Galilean manifestation: yet not only he altogether ignores it, but the more obvious inference from his text would be, that no such manifestation took place. In regard to this particular fact, we urged in our last number (p. 227) an argument, of which we may here remind our readers. We argued that no objection can with any show of plausibility be devised (in addressing Christians) from the silence of an Evangelist; because Christians know that the Evangelists were *inspired*. "When I am dealing with merely human writers, I can often reasonably derive an argument of strong probability from their silence. I know in large measure the motives which can possibly have influenced them; and I may infer with great probability, that there was no reason which could have induced them to be silent on some given fact, had they known it. But I know no more than an infinitely small portion of the Holy Ghost's possible 'motives.' And I cannot therefore reasonably draw any conclusion as even faintly probable, from the mere *silence* of an *inspired* writer." But we asked also a preliminary question.

We would ask—do not the special literary characteristics of the present time lead a Christian inquirer to imagine a difficulty in the Gospels, which does not exist? Putting aside all reference to *inspiration*—was it an improbable thing, that such persons as S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John should each content himself with recording those facts which specially suited his own purpose? Was it an improbable thing, that no one among them should have contemplated the more ambitious project, of exhibiting our Lord's life as a whole, with due proportion of constituent parts? Or conversely. Would their contemporaries have naturally inferred, from the silence of this or that Evangelist on some one even extremely important fact, that he was *ignorant* of that fact? Is not such an inference rather the inference of a modern critic, than the inference which would have been drawn by a contemporary reader? (p. 227).

F. Coleridge has some very apt remarks to a somewhat similar effect:—

Here, however, we must take into consideration the danger of transferring the common habits of thought of times like our own to the very different habits of generations so far removed from us in so many ways as that to which the Evangelists belonged. We live in the midst of a multitudinous literature, of which the most rare and costly productions are more within the reach of every one, than was the case with the commonest books in the time of the early Church. The writer of any book on any subject has not only to make himself acquainted with the works of others on that subject,

but he must expect also that his own readers are acquainted with them as well as himself. He must thus take note of points of collision or contact ; at least, even if he resolves, for reasons of his own, to decline controversy, he cannot let himself seem to contradict writers whom he holds in reverence without affording his readers the means of explaining the apparent difficulty for themselves. But the age in which the Evangelists lived and wrote was no age for foot-notes, or illustrations, or dissertations appended to the text. The need for these things had not been created by the multiplicity of books and the general habit of reading (i. 52).

Our author applies this principle, in interpreting the supplementary narration of S. John on one part of the Passion. And to our mind this passage is so important in its bearing on the *whole* Gospel History, that we will quote it entire :—

The whole passage in S. John is supplementary, like all the rest of his account of what took place in the Passion of our Lord. He wishes to supply two new pieces of information at the same time. One of these pieces relates to our Lord, and the other to S. Peter. S. John joins them together because he is here supplementing the other Evangelists, who have joined the two together—that is, the taking of our Lord to Caiaphas and the entrance of S. Peter into the court. All through his account of the Passion, as for instance when he speaks of the coming of Judas, or of S. Peter's attack on Malchus, or of the leading of our Lord to the Governor, or of His scourging, he begins by taking, as it were, a text from the former Evangelists, to which he then adds information of his own. Here he has to tell us of our Lord's first examination, and of the blow on the cheek which He received, and he has also to tell us how it was that S. Peter gained admission to the court of the High Priest's palace, and so indirectly to explain how it was that he came to be attacked by the servant-girl as he sat by the fire. The story might thus be told by a modern writer :—

"It has been stated already, as the reader knows, that our Lord was taken by His captors to the palace of Caiaphas the High Priest, and that S. Peter followed Him, and gained admission to the court, where he was challenged by the servant-girl, and denied his Master. There are two things to be added to this account. In the first place, our Lord was taken to Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was the High Priest of that year, and had given the advice to the Jews that it was well that one man should die for the nation. In the second place, there was another disciple as well as S. Peter who gained admission into the palace of the High Priest. This one was well known to the High Priest, and so was admitted at once, and when he saw S. Peter outside, trying to get in, he went and spoke to the maid at the door, and thus it was that S. Peter obtained admission. This was the maid who charged S. Peter with being, like the other, one of the disciples of our Lord—for S. Peter not only went in, but stood by the fire warming himself with the servants and officers. Now, as to the first point, which relates to our Lord Himself. The High Priest began to question Him as to His disciples and His doctrine, and when our Lord answered that He had always taught openly, and that anything He had said might be

made matter of evidence against Him by those who had heard Him, but it was not well to ask Him to accuse Himself, He received a rude, savage blow on the cheek from one of the servants for answering the High Priest in such a manner. Our Lord calmly expostulated with the striker of the blow, who might have borne witness against Him if He had said anything amiss, but who did wrong to strike Him. This is what passed at that first examination. Now as to the second point. Annas sent our Lord as a prisoner to Caiaphas, and, as was said just now, Peter, having obtained admission in the way mentioned already into the court of the High Priest's house, was standing and warming himself. It had also been mentioned that his mode of entrance had excited the suspicion of the servant-girl who kept the door, and thus it was that the first charge against him was made by her. Then they charged him again, and he denied again, and the third time he denied in the same way, having been accused of being in the garden by a servant who was a near kinsman of Malchus, whose ear he had there cut off."

This is perhaps the way in which the story would have been told by a writer of our time. But it would not differ in anything from the account of S. John, except in the addition of a few connecting and explanatory particles (ii. pp. 387, 8).

We are thus brought to the threshold of a further inquiry. We have said that something of this kind occurs again and again. Two incidents in our Lord's life, closely resembling each other but yet distinct, are recorded by two different Evangelists. It hardly ever happens however, that the *same* Evangelist recounts *both* these incidents.* How is this last circumstance to be explained? F. Coleridge replies by a theory, which he has long and consistently held, and which he applies with great power in a large number of different ways. He considers that each Evangelist was well acquainted with the previous Gospels. Accordingly, in his view, S. Luke e.g. purposely omits some narrative which S. Matthew has given, and inserts instead some very similar but distinct event which S. Matthew has omitted. Without pretending to any confident opinion on this matter, we may nevertheless venture to say that F. Coleridge has not (so far as we see) given his mind fully to one argument, prominently adduced by those who differ from him. It might seem to follow from his view, that in the numerous cases where the same event is recorded by the three synoptists with some slight difference of wording, the later Evangelists have been sitting in judgment on the preceding Gospels, and have altered their phraseology for some definite reason. This supposition would involve much difficulty; as we could show if our space permitted us to give instances; but at last perhaps F. Coleridge's theory does not require him

* We call to mind no exception to this remark, except the two feedings of the multitude.

to make it. Still on this point, for our own part, we are rather inclined to follow our second author; who thinks that no one of the synoptists "took account in his composition of what the other had written" (p. xv.). And at all events we doubt not F. Coleridge would himself say, that the traditional oral teaching counted for more with each Evangelist, than did the antecedent Gospels.

If we be asked how, *except* on F. Coleridge's theory, that general feature of the Gospel history can be explained to which we above refer—our own bias would be of the following kind. The Evangelists were entrusted with what in some sense may be called the most sacred commission ever assigned to men,* that of narrating the human utterances and actions of Almighty God. As F. Coleridge constantly reminds us, it is comparatively a very small part of these utterances and actions, which have been placed on record; and these had to be selected from an indefinite multitude. We cannot think it unreasonable to suppose, that the work of inspiration would be (if we may so express ourselves) more prominent and active in these than in other books of Scripture; and that a direct suggestion was given to each Evangelist, as to what selection of facts was marked out for him by the Holy Ghost.

Our second author however certainly goes farther on this head than we can follow him; for he accounts it doubtful (p. xv.) whether even S. John took account of his predecessors. To our mind the internal evidence tells most strongly in the opposite sense. In those comparatively few portions of his history which are occupied with events narrated in the other Gospels, his purpose has every appearance of being supplementary to theirs; and he gives prominence to different incidents.

We are thus led to another cognate particular. F. Coleridge throughout draws a much more prominent distinction than is commonly done, between S. Luke and his two predecessors: both as regards the general purpose or character of his work, and as regards the scene of the events which he records.† We are disposed to follow our author in both these particulars; and at all events we follow him with considerable

* We set forth more fully what we here mean in July, 1875, p. 175, and October, 1876, p. 318.

† Partly perhaps for this reason, F. Coleridge never uses the word "synoptic," so frequently employed by modern critics to denote the three earlier Gospels. He suggests indeed a different phrase (i. 105). He calls the three first Gospels "historical," in contradistinction to S. John's which is "doctrinal." We confess we are not quite attracted by this terminology. It seems to us, that the more obvious antithesis to "historical" would be "mythical."

confidence on the latter. He mentions in his Preface (p. lv.) that this is in some sense the most original part of his structure. He considers (ii. 23) that "more than half the chapters which S. Luke devotes to the Ministry of our Lord are taken up with a period, of which the earlier Evangelists say hardly anything." And in pp. 53 et seq. he gives in some detail his reasons, for his view as to what happened during this period. He holds that, during the interval covered by those chapters, our Lord was preaching throughout Judæa, just as in the earlier period He was preaching throughout Galilee; that in Judæa, just as previously in Galilee, He organized and trained a permanent body of disciples; though no doubt that organization and training would be less complete, from the circumstance that His preaching in Judæa must have been of shorter duration than in Galilee. F. Coleridge bases his argument on the fact, indubitably declared by S. Peter (Acts x. 37), that our Lord did at some time or other preach "through all Judæa"; and if so, it is difficult even to suggest any possible date for the fact, except the very one in question. He supplements this argument "by the aid of internal evidence. This evidence is of different kinds and various degrees of conclusiveness; but," as he truly observes, "when many such arguments converge, it is difficult to resist their force" (p. 53). We must say that he carries us along with him entirely, in the whole of this masterly discussion.

Here by the way is the solution of a difficulty, which we have often thought that harmonists treat somewhat too lightly: we mean the second promulgation of the Lord's Prayer (Luke xi. 1 et seq.). It seemed hard to understand, how that prayer, when once taught, can have been otherwise than in daily use among the disciples; and how they could possibly therefore have again asked Him to teach them to pray. But His disciples here mentioned were—as regards the enormous majority—a different body altogether from those addressed in Galilee; and may well therefore have been ignorant of the Prayer.

All that we have been saying converges in some sense on a logically prior question: What was the exact origin of the Four Gospels? How shall we account at once for their striking coincidences and their striking divergencies? There is hardly any question, which has so harassed modern critics as this; but by degrees general consent seems settling down on some such view of the matter as F. Coleridge gives. The question is so fundamental, that we are sure our readers will be glad of a long extract:—

It is obvious on the face of the question, that the four Gospels do not

profess to give us a complete view, even of that comparatively small part of our Lord's earthly existence to which they refer. It may also be considered as a matter on which scholars are agreed that in a certain sense "the Gospel" existed before it was written. When S. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, spoke of S. Luke—as it is commonly thought—as the "brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches," he probably wrote before what we now have as the Gospel of S. Luke existed in its present form. Whether or not it was the special office of those whom he speaks of in another Epistle as "evangelists," and of whom the deacon Philip was one, to relate and comment upon the incidents of our Lord's life and His carefully recorded sayings, it is clear that there must have been from the earliest days some such office and some such teaching, on which the practical system of Christian morality, the imitation of the virtues of our Lord considered as our great Example, and the following out of His peculiar precepts and counsels of perfection, must have been built. The Epistles of the Apostles evidently suppose a large range of practical, we may surely say catechetical teaching of this kind, and the basis on which this must have been built must have been the substance of our Gospels. It is not straining conjecture too far to suppose that something of this kind formed a considerable part of that "ministry of the word" to which, together with prayer, the Apostles mainly devoted themselves in the infant Church at Jerusalem. But the existence and daily application of teaching of this kind, which embodied in so large a measure the acts and sayings of our Blessed Lord during the time which He had spent, more or less, in the company of the Apostles, must of necessity have led in the course of time to the formation of some authentic manuals, as we should call them, on the subject. At first no doubt the Apostles would themselves be the chief instructors, and their memories, aided by the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, would secure that faithfulness and uniformity in the relation of what our Lord had said and done and commanded, which the importance of the subject-matter required. In process of time, and indeed very shortly, others would have to be employed in the same work.

But further, it would be altogether contrary to the spirit of the Christian system, that this most important sphere should have been left to unauthorized teachers or to hazards of human minds and memories. It is probable that long before the Apostles separated, as the preaching of the Gospel spread from city to city and from land to land, this teaching concerning our Blessed Lord would have become fixed, regulated, and recorded. This may be considered as the nucleus of what we now call the Gospel history. Even before it was committed to writing, it would take shape and form and character, according to the persons who were its authoritative exponents, and the spiritual needs, or even the controversial position, or again the national and social peculiarities, of the community to which it was addressed (pp. xii.-xiv.).

In full accordance with this general view, F. Coleridge expresses another particular, which is very important for a critical apprehension of the Gospels:—

It is by no means inconsistent either with reverence to the Evangelists or

with the probabilities of the case, that the materials out of which the Gospels were framed existed in detached pieces before they were united. In the earliest of the Gospels—that is, as we believe, in that of S. Matthew—we have frequent traces of the separate existence of the several portions which he has arranged with so much care and skill. He usually begins a new paragraph with the word *τότε* , then, as he would probably have begun the relation of the miracles or the parables or the anecdotes when he was expounding them to his hearers in the Church at Jerusalem. There are traces of the same feature in S. Mark and in S. Luke : and in S. John's Gospel, which is nothing but a succession of fragments, as we might call them, the same principle of division may be observed, though his divisions are fewer and larger than those of the others. The language and style of the several Evangelists are quite sufficiently their own to enable us to feel sure that every word in every Gospel comes straight from the author whose name that Gospel bears ; although there are passages—as in the early chapters of S. Luke—*where they seem to be clothing in a very transparent veil the information which has come to them from others*. But this general principle, as to the original form in which a great part of the Gospels may have existed, is especially to be kept in mind as an answer to a great number of difficulties which arise as to order and connection. It stands to reason, that in books thus composed there will be apparent an abruptness of transition, or a want of perfect dovetailing, which is no fault of the writers, and by which critics may often be misled (pp. xxxix., xl.).

We have italicised one clause, which manifestly refers to the place occupied by our Blessed Lady in originating the Gospel Tradition.

We now pass, from the *principles* on which the Gospel narrative should be constructed, to the *contents* of that construction itself. It is obvious, as F. Coleridge points out (Preface, p. xxxiv.) that this “can only be a very inadequate representation of what” our Lord’s “life truly was.” It may be said perhaps with an approximation to truth, that the Evangelists confined themselves to a selection from those acts and words of our Lord, which might be made a matter of fruitful meditation to Christians of every period. Thus on the one hand, as F. Coleridge points out (p. xxxiv.), “our Lord must have given the Apostles a great deal of instruction about the Church, the Sacraments, and other similar subjects” on which the Gospels are silent. But then such instructions are rather important to Christians as regards their *result*, than as regards our Lord’s method of imparting them ; and are therefore omitted. On the other hand (as we have urged on more than one previous occasion), if Mary be really what Catholics believe—if she belong to a sphere entirely removed above the apprehensions of ordinary men—it follows that the notion of recording for future ages her colloquies with her

Son would be simply wild and extravagant. As well might one think of unfolding to mortal men the conversation of angels in heaven. We cannot wonder then that the Gospels "tell us nothing" of the intercourse between Him and "the one heart which understood Him and loved Him and was loved by Him more than all" (ii. 214). On the same principle perhaps may be explained another circumstance, to which F. Coleridge draws attention: the very observable silence of the Gospels, on our Lord's words during the great Forty Days. Those words would probably refer in large measure to ecclesiastical principles, which the faithful were to learn from the Church's practical teaching; and to which our Blessed Lord's actual words would perhaps communicate no special force or impressiveness. On the other hand the great miracle of the Resurrection must, when fully apprehended, have given the Apostles a certain marvellous elevation of thought, which made them perhaps fit recipients for a body of communications quite above the apprehension of the ordinary Christian.*

From what has been said it follows, that the first thirty years of our Lord's life might have been expected to occupy indefinitely less space in the Gospels, than the three years of His public ministry. These thirty years constitute the first of the periods into which His history is naturally divided; and the following general remarks on this period are worthy of devout and deep meditation:—

It is of immediate importance that we should remark that these mysteries, which are as true and as actual, so to speak, as any of the simply external doings or sufferings of our Blessed Lord, belong almost entirely to that spiritual order which underlies all the incidents and vicissitudes of His Life. The choice and preparation of Mary, her Immaculate Conception, the endowment of her soul at its first dawn of life with spiritual graces which surpassed the attainments of the highest angels—or again, the whole spiritual history of the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, or of His chosen servants, S. Joseph and S. John, the interior Life of the Sacred Heart in the womb of His Mother, its intense and unceasing activity in the love of God and man, or the same Life as continued after His Birth, through the thirty years of the Hidden Life—all these and other facts like them belong in great measure to that unseen world, which is worth far more in the sight of heaven than anything material or, as we call it, historical, in a merely human sense. These things belong, indeed, to the great Counsel of God as unfolded in prophecy, and touch here and there upon the ordinary levels of history in their fulfilment of that manifold anticipation and promise of which they were the subject. But what meets the eye in all these mysteries is com-

* F. Coleridge mentions one ancient interpretation of John xxi. 25, which understands the Evangelist as there saying, that there are many of our Lord's unrecorded sayings, which the world would be unable to *apprehend*.

paratively trifling and slender. The spirits of heaven gazed with that intense eagerness of desire and wonder of which S. Peter speaks, on the simple incidents the chain of which we are to try to draw out, but they could read beneath the surface, and understand better than the most illuminated of earthly theologians the great part of God in what seemed outwardly so wanting in significance. But the Evangelical narrative begins, indeed, with a grand declaration of the Eternal Godhead and Sonship of Him Who became Man for us, a declaration which sums up the theology of the Church as to the Person of Christ; and then it follows the external and human incidents, *which were the mask, as it may be called, of truths which are left unspoken*. The uninstructed reader might almost follow its details without more suspicion of what lay behind them than was felt by the busy worldlings of Bethlehem or the proud ecclesiastics at Jerusalem. Great as are the manifestations of our Lord, even in the mysteries of His Infancy, they do not strike upon the eye except of such as those who were watching for the salvation of Israel (i. 23, 4).

For want of a more appropriate opportunity, we may here draw attention to F. Coleridge's rationale of S. Matthew's various quotations from the Old Testament. There is no particular in the Gospels, of which more vigorous use is made by any one who desires to disparage their authority. F. Coleridge writes as follows:—

To him the whole of Scripture and all the history of mankind, and especially of the chosen people, is one great prophecy of Jesus Christ. This truth involves a further truth—that of the many kinds and varieties of prophecy, which is at some times and in some cases more direct and formal than in others. The references in S. Matthew's Gospel to types and anticipations of incidents relating to our Lord's Person are sometimes tacit, and do not always lie on the surface. When he makes a direct application of a text, or of a series of texts, it is not always necessary that the words which he quotes, or to which he refers, should have no other more immediate reference than that which he draws from them. If the whole history of the chosen people, for instance, was ordered as it was ordered in reference to the Incarnation, then the calling of the Israelites out of Egypt, and the incidents which made the mothers of Rama wail for their children, were in themselves prophecies of our Lord. But we must not here enlarge on the subject of S. Matthew's use of prophecy in its largest sense. It is enough to point out that those mysteries of our Lord's Childhood which he selects are introduced by him with the most direct purpose of eliciting from them instances of the argument from prophecy, which must have been so familiar to himself and the other Apostles in their first disputes with the Jews or their first instructions to Christians (i. 44).

As regards the events following our Lord's Nativity, we entirely go along with F. Coleridge: and so also does our second author, as far as he expresses himself. In truth, not only we have always thought the arrangement given by him the only satisfactory one, but we are disposed to agree with him (i. 56)

that "the question is not difficult to settle"; though it has given rise no doubt to interminable discussions. There is not the slightest reason to infer from S. Matthew's narrative, that the visit of the Magi took place immediately after the Nativity. Indeed both ii. 11 and ii. 16 would rather point to a different conclusion: for (1) our Lord and His Mother were now in a "house"; and (2) the date of our Lord's birth, which Herod learned from the wise men, led him to massacre all the infants under two years old. As F. Coleridge well argues, even if the ecclesiastical observance of the Epiphany points to an authentic anniversary (which is very doubtful), the visit of the Magi might most intelligibly have taken place a year and twelve days, or two years and twelve days, after the Nativity. Then again—unless we give a very forced interpretation to Matt. ii. 22—we must admit that, when the Holy Family returned from Egypt, they looked on the land of Judæa as their natural home. Nor lastly is Luke ii. 39 fairly reconcilable with any hypothesis, implying that they remained for any considerable time in Bethlehem after the Presentation. Everything points to F. Coleridge's inference (i. 58), that "before he was in any fear from Herod or Archelaus, S. Joseph had moved his residence from Galilee." Nor can any supposition be more natural. For it was to be expected, that a knowledge of the relation in which they were to stand towards the Messiah, should in various ways alter the plans of our Lady and S. Joseph.

There are no other harmonistic difficulties as regards our Lord's hidden life. We have already given what seems to us the obvious reason, why so little should be narrated concerning the ineffable colloquies which must have been so frequent, between those three Persons whom devout Catholics delight to designate as "the earthly Trinity." But there is one further question, which we may here touch. It has been thought by some that, during His public ministry, our Lord separated Himself from the company of His Mother; and that, as part of His sufferings, He deprived Himself of the solace He would have derived from her presence. It is a touching and beautiful suggestion; but we fancy that the other opinion is far more common in the Church. And so F. Coleridge (i. 11) mentions our Lord's "continuation of His Home Life through the period of His active ministry." Indeed even a Protestant commentator has argued with much force, that if such a separation between our Lord and His Mother had then taken place, it would have been at the beginning rather than the end of His ministry that He would have committed her to S. John's care (John xix. 26, 7).

As to the public ministry itself, F. Coleridge subdivides that period on a principle, which (so far as we happen to know) is as strikingly original as it is eminently satisfactory. He takes as its first subdivision the time, during which there had been no definite rupture (if we may so express ourselves) between Him and the Jewish rulers. The general characteristics of this time are beautifully set forth in i. 89 et seq. And it is remarkable that, while it lasted, He abstained from definitively instituting the Church's organization, and thus left the matter in some sense open. The attitude however of the Jewish rulers, as this time came to a close, rendered any further delay of the kind impossible.

We cannot doubt (says F. Coleridge) that in the Providence of God a way could have been found in which the organization of the new kingdom, with its law, its hierarchy, its sacrifice, its 'sacraments, and its priesthood, might have seemed to grow out of the Jewish institutions themselves without any violent rupture or antagonism between the ancient and the new dispensations. What use might have been made by our Lord of the ecclesiastical system of Judaism if its rulers had thrown themselves at His feet instead of becoming His persecutors, it is impossible for us to divine. But it is significant that just at the time when their hostility becomes so pronounced and so unscrupulous as to lead to plots and combinations against His life, He seems to take steps which He had not hitherto taken towards the formation of a body or a community of His own. It is at the point of time which we have now reached that the formal selection of the Twelve Apostles is placed by the Evangelists, and it is clear that from this time up to that of the confession of S. Peter and the promise of the foundation of the Church, our Lord's attention was concentrated in an especial manner and degree upon those who were to become the founders of that Church after Him. A very considerable part of the sayings and teachings of this period was devoted to His Apostles alone, and we shall see that before its close they are sent out to preach in our Lord's name, after very particular instructions from Him, and after having received the gift of miracles in order to authenticate their preaching (i. 179, 180).

This second period culminated in S. Peter's great confession, and in the Transfiguration: events placed by all three synoptists in closest juxtaposition; and to which (so far as we happen to know) F. Coleridge is the first harmonist who has given due prominence, as a conspicuous landmark in the history. As to the third subdivision of the public ministry—reaching from S. Peter's confession to the Passion—we cannot do better than quote F. Coleridge's general account of it.

We have seen that the positive hostility to our Blessed Lord on the part of the Jewish authorities, which was first manifested in Jerusalem on occa-

sion of His miracle at the Probatic Pool, and afterwards grew into a more malignant persecution in Galilee, was, together with its consequences, the immediate cause of a change in His method of action and teaching, of which change we have had to observe many instances in the history of the second period of His Public Life. In that stage of His teaching which we are now to consider we find many instances of the same hostile feeling against Him on the part of the authorities, and it is obvious that it only deepened as time went on. But in this third and last period of the Public Life we shall have to remark on further changes in our Lord's manner, which are only partially to be attributed to the attitude of determined hostility towards Him which the Chief Priests at Jerusalem maintained. Another cause, less mournful in character, had its effect now. That cause was the confirmed faith of the Apostles, as expressed in the confession of S. Peter, which closes the second period of His Public Life, and which may be said to have set our Lord free to speak, to them at least directly, and indirectly even to others, of His approaching Passion, and of all that was contained and implied in it, more especially the doctrine of the Church and the outlines of its laws as the new kingdom of God. At the same time we find our Lord no longer avoiding His persecutors as before, but confronting them in Jerusalem itself, not merely at the great Feast of Tabernacles, but at another minor festival, and indeed, as far as we can gather, teaching for a considerable space of time in their immediate neighbourhood, and throughout the towns and villages of Judæa itself, with the same publicity and authority as before in Galilee during the two first years of His Ministry (ii. 1, 2).

We may here interpose a few words, on an episodical question, not without its interest; a question on which we were very desirous of finding what is F. Coleridge's judgment, because we ventured to offer a short treatment of it a few years ago: July, 1872. We refer to the identity or non-identity existing between S. Mary Magdalene, Mary sister of Lazarus, and the peccatrix of Luke vii. 37. We have been much gratified to find, that almost every part of the position we assumed receives F. Coleridge's sanction. Thus (i. 311) he holds that John xi. 2 by itself suffices to establish the identity of Mary of Bethany with the peccatrix. Then as regards the identification of S. Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany, the only difficulty lies in the latter not being ever expressly called Magdalene.

At the same time, it may fairly be argued that this silence is easily explained, and, indeed, that the whole narrative taken together almost if not entirely supplies the absence of the identification by name. The only Evangelist who names Mary the sister of Lazarus as the anointer at Bethany is S. John. If we are asked why he does not call her the Magdalene, and why, on the other hand, he uses the epithet Magdalene when he speaks of the women at the foot of the Cross and when he relates the history of the Resurrection, the answer is at hand. In these two places where he mentions

Mary Magdalene; there are other Mariés, either mentioned by himself, or present to his mind, from whom she was to be distinguished. It is not so in the narrative of the supper at Bethany. It seems to be S. John's way to call her Mary simply, when he can, and only to use the other name, Magdalene, when he is obliged for the sake of distinctness. And in the second place, the history of the supper at Bethany itself is enough to identify Mary the sister of Lazarus with the Mary Magdalene of the Resurrection. For our Lord speaks of the anointing which was then performed as a part of His funeral rites, and bids the disciples let Mary keep what she has done for His burial. These words seem to imply that the Mary of whom our Lord spoke would certainly be foremost in the endeavours of the holy women His followers to anoint and embalm His Sacred Body, but that she would not be able then to do what she had done at Bethany. It is almost impossible to suppose that this Mary would either have been absent at such a time, or that her presence would not have been noted. But nothing is said in the history of the Resurrection of Mary the sister of Lazarus, unless she be the same person as Mary Magdalene. If she is the same person, then our Lord's words at the supper are easily understood, and the whole history of this devout lover of His becomes complete (i. 312).

We think that the only point connected with this episode, on which F. Coleridge has come to a different conclusion from our own, is his identifying the "village" of Luke x. 38 with Bethany. On this point also our second author (p. 91) is of the same mind. The matter is of extremely slight importance; but we are still disposed to see preponderating force in the arguments which we adduced on the other side, in July, 1872.

Our limits here warn us that we draw towards a conclusion. And since we have so recently written (October, 1876) on the "Gospel Narrative of the Resurrection," it is an obvious course to occupy our remaining space by briefly considering F. Coleridge's treatment of this theme. Before entering however on this, we cannot refrain from earnestly pressing on our readers' attention a singularly beautiful and ascetically practical passage (ii. 293-5), in which our author summarily exhibits "the particular causes and phases" of our Lord's "terrible agony." Every sentence in these pages will be found a fruitful theme for meditation: all the more efficacious, because F. Coleridge so carefully measures his language, and abstains from anything like vague or rhetorical declamation.

Passing on now to the Resurrection,—F. Coleridge does not fail to insist on what was the predominating purpose of our October article. He points out that "the divinely-appointed evidence as to the Resurrection is altogether independent of" the Gospels (ii. 398). He then thus proceeds:—

It is true that the Gospels record more than one of the occasions on which our Lord manifested Himself to His Apostles. But their witness was made to all the world long before the Gospels were written. As the Scriptures are the history of Revelation, rather than Revelation itself, as the Gospels are the records of our Lord's teaching and legislation, rather than that teaching and that legislation themselves, so in this particular part of their works the Evangelists are the historians of the divinely appointed testimony to the Resurrection of our Lord—they do not themselves furnish that testimony (ii. 398).

This truth needs to be insisted on again and again at the present day; because the excuse now ordinarily adopted by infidels, for ignoring the absolutely irrefragable historical proof of the Resurrection, is to insist on what they account irreconcilable discrepancies in the Gospel narrative. We have urged on previous occasions that, even if these discrepancies were admitted to be indubitably irreconcilable—a supposition (we need hardly say) remote in the furthest degree from truth—such a fact would not even appreciably weaken the historical certainty of the Resurrection.

It is not controversialists only however, who are tempted to wish that the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection were far fuller and far more obviously intelligible than it is.

The devout contemplative soul may also complain that, whereas in the other portions of their narratives the Evangelists keep our Lord ever before us as the central figure in the picture—so central and prominent that all others are not merely subordinate to Him, but are actually, so to say, dwarfed by the extent to which He fills the eye—now, that we come to the moment of His triumph, to the gathering in, as it were, of the harvest for which His life and sufferings were the seed-time, He is almost withdrawn from our sight save for occasional visits and manifestations, which do not fill up a tithe even of the short space of time during which we know that He was on earth after He had risen from the dead (ii. 393, 4).

For our own part indeed we must ever think, that no single portion of the Gospels—not even their narrative of the Passion—contains pictures more exquisitely beautiful and elevating or more fruitful for devotion, than are contained in these concluding chapters; but it cannot be denied, of course, that the records of the Forty Days, however attractive, are very scanty. We have already mentioned two not improbable reasons for this circumstance. F. Coleridge, in addition, suggests another of quite a different kind. Had the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection been such as to admit of being raised into an independent proof of that central verity, the Apostolic office would in some sense have been encroached on; because it was Apostles as such, and not Evangelists as

such, who were appointed to be authenticating witnesses of the Resurrection (ii. 396, 7).

The harmonistic difficulties of this period refer exclusively to the events which took place on the Day itself of the Resurrection; but (as is well known) there are hardly so great difficulties in any other part of the Four Gospels. Without professing here to discuss them—which would carry us quite too far—we will briefly comment on one or two parts of F. Coleridge's exposition.

We incline to think that he is certainly right in his interpretation (ii. 392) of Matt. xxviii. 1. And though we fancy that the great majority of commentators are on the other side, including perhaps our second author, we believe that Patrizi takes the same view as F. Coleridge. This verse then refers—not to Easter morning—but to the near approach of sunset on Holy Saturday: at which time S. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary paid a visit of devotion to the Holy Sepulchre. This explanation leaves S. Matthew's meaning entirely vague, as to who were the women mentioned by him at v. 5; and how soon they arrived, after the earthquake had taken place, and after the consternation of the guards had left free access to visitors.

Our author's general principles of harmony on the events of Easter Day are thus stated.

It may be allowed, however, to think that, the more we separate the several visits to the sepulchre and the several visions of angels, the more nearly we shall approach to the historical truth in this matter. They are like a cluster of islands, which seem to be one to a ship approaching them in a straight line from a distance, which are seen to lie one far behind the other as the same ship passes them. We cannot really be sure that there were not four or five parties of holy women instead of two only. The names which are mentioned in the Gospels may be the names of the chief persons in each. The names which are given in S. Matthew and S. Mark are those of the women who prepared spices and ointments either on the Friday night or on the Saturday night. It is by no means necessary to suppose that when these two Evangelists speak of the women who went to the sepulchre on the Sunday morning, they mean us to understand them to speak just of those women and of no others, or of all those whom they have named as being in one party (ii. 447).

This view of the case seems to us entirely just, and may be of much use in solving difficulties. Again, F. Coleridge understands Luke xxiv. 10, as we suggested in October, p. 333; indeed he had made clear that such was his opinion, in the Latin "*Vita Vitæ*." S. Luke, he says, in that verse, "gives the names of all who, at different times that morning,

gave the Apostles the information as to what they had seen" (p. 447). We pointed out in October—we forgot to mention we had derived the remark from a Protestant commentator—that the change of *tense*, between vv. 9 and 10, adds much probability to this interpretation.

On the other hand, F. Coleridge insists on the literal meaning of "orto jam sole" (Mark xvi, 2) which we were disposed to soften (October, pp. 332, 3); and our second author agrees with him in this. Our difficulty in this interpretation does not arise from any harmonistic perplexity, but exclusively from S. Mark's own language. We do not see how it is possible to take *both* "orto sole" and "valde mane" in their obvious sense. Certainly, we have not happened to see any instance cited by the advocates of F. Coleridge's view, in which the phrase "*λαν πρωι*" refers to so late a period as sunrise; and in i. 35 S. Mark himself uses the phrase of a time when it was yet dark: "*πρωι εννυχια λαν.*" However, the difficulty, as we have said, is in no sense harmonistic. If Mark i. 2 really refers to sunrise, Greswell's supposition gives an obvious means of reconciling it with John xx. 1. Greswell supposes, that the holy women named by S. Mark had slept at Bethany; that S. John refers to S. Mary Magdalene's time of setting out, and S. Mark to her time of arrival. It may possibly be, as Greswell also suggests, that S. Mark intended elliptically to express *both* times.

We have much difficulty on this particular matter in accepting F. Coleridge's harmony, for the following reason. It is certain from Luke xxiv. 23, that tidings reached the Apostles of an angelic vision, before tidings reached them of our Lord having appeared. We cannot see how F. Coleridge's location of our Blessed Lord's interview with S. Mary Magdalene (John xx. 14), and with the other holy women (Matt. xxviii, 9), is consistent with this indubitable fact.

Lastly, we do not think that our author does entire justice to the pre-eminent place occupied by the great Galilean manifestation which S. Matthew records. This manifestation was the only one wherein He appeared to the whole body of His disciples; and it was also the only one which He specially predicted before His Passion.

However, we need hardly say that, in these as in any other demurs we have made, we speak entirely under correction. We could not feel any kind of confidence in pitting our own judgment on such matters against the decision of one, who has made them the theme of such long-continued study, and who possesses so singularly keen an instinct in this kind of

inquiry. Nor can we conclude our imperfect comment without expressing a sincere hope and prayer, that F. Coleridge may have strength and opportunity for bringing to a completion the great and noble enterprise, which he has so piously and opportunely undertaken.

ART. IV.—PRIMITIVE MAN IN THE SOMME VALLEY.

1. *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man.* By SIR CHARLES LYELL, Bart., M.A., F.R.A.S. Fourth Edition. London, 1873.
2. *Prehistoric Times, as illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages.* By SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart. Third Edition. London, 1872.
3. *The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man.* By SIR JOHN LUBBOCK. Third Edition. London, 1875.
4. *The Recent Origin of Man as illustrated by Geology and the Modern Science of Prehistoric Archaeology.* By JAMES C. SOUTHALL. Philadelphia : Lippincott & Co. London : Trübner & Co. 1875.

IT is only within the last forty years that the hitherto generally received opinion that man has been at most six or eight thousand years upon the earth has been challenged with any show of reason by scientific men. And yet it may now be said that in the world of science the doctrine of the remote antiquity of the human race holds almost undisputed sway. The systems of chronology which assign to man an age of—at the furthest—considerably less than 10,000 years are regarded as almost obsolete, and the only point of disagreement between the eminent professors of the new theory is as to whether man's age on earth should be placed, with Lyell and Lubbock, at 200,000 years, or with more enthusiastic students of prehistoric archaeology, at epochs which far exceed even a million years.*

* Of those who have accepted the doctrine of the remote antiquity of man we may name amongst those now living or recently deceased—Lyell, Lubbock, Darwin, Huxley, Falconer, Prestwich, Geikie, Owen, Christie, Lartet, de Quatrefages, Broca, Boucher de Perthes, Cartailhac, Bourgeois, Ponzi, Gastaldi, Ceselli, Vogt, Nilsson, Worsaae, Steenstrup, Wilson, Agassiz, and Whitney, names which may be fairly taken to represent the scientific opinion of England, France, Italy, Northern Europe, and the United States.

The first step in raising this question in its modern sense was taken about forty years ago, when M. Boucher de Perthes found in the gravel-beds of the Somme, near Abbeville—at one place seventy feet above the level of the stream, at another, under thirty feet of peat—rude flint implements which he proclaimed to be the work of men, and which were found unmistakably associated with the bones of the mammoth, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus, the lion, and the reindeer. It was not until 1859 that his discoveries were generally accepted, although the first results of his investigations had been published as early as 1838. He has himself acknowledged since then that the mistrust of the scientific world was not unreasonable. The traces of human workmanship on the stone axes which he first discovered were indeed vague and doubtful enough, but they satisfied M. de Perthes. He had perhaps a keener eye than his brother *savans*, or he made a fortunate guess, like many another pioneer in the paths of original research. He persevered in his investigations, and his perseverance was rewarded by the discovery of tools of flint on which the work of human hands is as distinctly visible as on a Sheffield chisel or a Damascus sword-blade.

But between 1838 and 1859 the range of prehistoric discovery had extended far beyond the valley of the Somme. The caves of Belgium and Languedoc had yielded a rich harvest of relics of primitive man; the dry season of 1854 had lowered the level of the Swiss lakes and revealed the remains of pile-built villages beneath their surface. The dolmens and tumuli of the North had been explored. The cave, the gravel-drift, the solitary mound, all gave up their silent witnesses of the work of man in far-off ages. It seemed that in Northern and Western Europe the earth was strewn with the hitherto unrecognized traces of tribes and nations of which they formed the sole record. So strange, so unexpected were these discoveries, so marvellous this restoration of many a page of hitherto unwritten history, that men did not, and indeed could not, scan very closely the evidence on which the bold theorists relied who claimed for these scattered relics a hitherto undreamed of antiquity, and placed far back in unnumbered centuries the epoch of the men who chipped out the rough flints of the Somme, or sheltered themselves in the caves of the Dordogne, or laid their dead to rest in the dolmens of the North.

The discoveries of primitive archæology, and the inferences which have been drawn from them, have indeed been so startling that it is no wonder that men who had no great confidence in the truth of revelation should have their very

limited trust in it completely shaken by the daring assertions of the votaries of the new science. But these assertions are now being very closely criticised; and it is easier to do this at the present time, when research upon the subject has not indeed exhausted the new field of discovery, but has so far explored it as to complete the evidence upon most points, and to show us what further we may reasonably expect to find. A few years ago such criticism would have been far less valuable; for though there was then more than enough of conflicting theory and reckless assertion, yet the discoveries which had been made were more limited, and the available evidence upon the subject was confessedly incomplete.

Of the works which have been published in support of the orthodox view that man's origin dates from a comparatively recent period, one of the most valuable is that of Mr. Southall, an American student of archaeology, whose treatise on the "Recent Origin of Man" has lately appeared simultaneously in London and in America. Mr. Southall's work is a detailed and elaborate examination and analysis of all the evidence which has been brought forward in favour of the theory of the remote antiquity of the human race. On each point ascertained fact is carefully distinguished from mere theory, and throughout the criticism is generally just, acute, and to the purpose, though, of course, in a work of such magnitude, and ranging over such a wide extent of ground, we can now and again detect an error of detail or an argument which is taken as proving more than the facts really warrant. At times, too, Mr. Southall fails to see the exact bearing of an adversary's line of reasoning, and there are times when, through the significance of some fact escaping his notice, he neglects very strong arguments which would greatly strengthen his case. The work is really one of detail, and though we might at times be tempted to wish that Mr. Southall had made his attack and defence more telling by omitting many of these particulars, and thus being able to group what was left more effectively into one general line of argument, on second thoughts we may say that the present arrangement has its advantages, for though it detracts from the ordinary merits of the book, it at the same time makes it a vast storehouse of material for those students who are able to give it more than a passing perusal, and to use it as a work of reference. It is only fair to add, that Mr. Southall does not pretend to anything like critical infallibility. "I do not flatter myself," he says, "that I have avoided all errors. That in a volume like the present, containing such a vast multitude of statements of fact, was nearly impos-

sible." But these minor errors can hardly be said to detract much from the value of the book, which, like all other works of the kind, must be read in a critical spirit; and though on several points we shall not follow Mr. Southall, we shall have to make frequent use of his work in our survey of the present state of the evidence on the question of the antiquity and primitive state of men.

But before we begin this we have still a few remarks to make upon the work before us. Mr. Southall is not a Catholic. To use his own words, he treats Moses as he would treat Herodotus, and he occasionally uses expressions such as no Catholic would adopt. Thus he says:—

New facts and new knowledge were constantly acquired during the first eighteen Christian centuries, and Christianity was tested during all that period. It is barely possible, we may allow, that it may be reserved for Mr. Darwin, or Sir John Lubbock, or Sir Charles Lyell, or Mr. Huxley, to strike at last the fatal blow. We do not think that they have done it.

Now a Catholic could not write thus. We know they have not struck, and never can strike, such a blow, just as we know that no one can ever prove to us the unreality of our own objective existence. But though he has not been blessed with the gift of faith, Mr. Southall is a valiant, unflinching, and able champion of revelation such as he knows it, and we meet him on the common ground which we both defend, and gladly welcome his aid and thank him for it, trusting that his earnest active love for the truth may be rewarded by its full communication to him in the bosom of the one true Church.

With regard to the controversy on primitive man, it is important to observe that there are really two distinct questions raised. First, what is the approximate epoch of man's earliest appearance upon earth? And secondly, what was his primitive condition? was it one of at least partial civilization under patriarchal rule? or did he come into the world into a state of semi-brutal barbarism? Now, on these two points what are the adverse views, and what is the evidence afforded by the facts ascertained by geology and archaeology of late years?

We are not going to enter here at any length into the much-vexed question of the chronology of the Bible. We shall merely lay down a few considerations which will be sufficient to guide us in dealing with this part of our subject. There is no explicit statement in the Bible as to the epoch of the creation. All that we have there is an imperfect series of statements of ages of patriarchs, periods of servitude, reigns of kings; nor can we feel quite certain of the authenticity

of many of these numbers, for the three oldest texts of the Scriptures—the Samaritan, the Hebrew, and the Septuagint—differ seriously from each other in their chronology. It remains then for commentators to construct various systems out of the data which we possess, and to decide which is the most probable chronology. For our part, we believe that the commonly received system, that of Ussher, which places the creation at 4004 B.C., is much too short. But we cannot hope to see the question definitely settled,—we can only obtain an approximation. What then are the limits between which we may suppose the truth to lie? According to Riccioli, of orthodox writers, no one has placed the era of creation higher than 7000 B.C. or lower than 3700. Now, as a mean between these two estimates we may take the chronology of the Septuagint. Apart from the authority which it derives from the fact that it is probably the most ancient system, that it was the chronology accepted by the early fathers, it has been adopted by many modern historians, and it accords very well with some of the best-ascertained results of recent research. Even from the Septuagint we can of course obtain only an approximate epoch. The systems based upon it give an era of the creation varying between 5904 and 5054 B.C. Riccioli makes the epoch “*dai settanta e dalla più vera storia umana*” 5634.* Hales made it 5411 B.C. Probably this is very near the truth. Now, the point for our consideration here is really not the epoch of the creation, but the epoch of the Deluge, the second beginning of human history,† and, according to Hales, the Septuagint places this at 3154 B.C. The next era, that of Abraham, is fixed at 2093 B.C., the date of his journey into Egypt being 2070 B.C., when he found a Pharaoh reigning there. Between the Deluge and Abraham’s visit to Egypt we have, therefore, a period of more than a thousand years, a period quite sufficient for the re-peopling of the world and the rise of many kingdoms, cities, and states. Now, for the sake of comparison, let us turn from the chronology derived from the Septuagint to the dates obtained from Manetho’s lists of the Egyptian dynasties. The shorter chronology, which is based on the very probable supposition that the various dynasties of Thinite, Memphite, Heracleopolite, Xoite, and Theban kings, were not all successive, but were often contemporary races reigning at the same time in

* See Moroni, “*Dizionario di Erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*,” vol. xxii, sub voce *Era*.

† No one has ever suggested for the remains of primitive man in Europe an antediluvian origin. Such a theory would not be tenable for an instant.

different cities,* places the earliest Thinite dynasty, that of Menes, at about 2700 B.C., or 450 years after the date we have taken for the Flood; and we find the Pharaohs of the Shepherd dynasties established at Memphis about 2080, while native dynasties (the IXth, XIIth, and XIVth) were reigning at Thebes, Heracleopolis, and Xoïs. Now, there is reason to believe that the war of Abraham with the four kings † was one of the results of the general movement in Eastern Asia which had culminated in the Shepherd invasion of Egypt, and that one of the Shepherd kings was Abraham's host. All this accords very well with the chronology of the Septuagint, and gives it additional weight. It is certainly to be preferred to the ordinary chronology, which gives only 400 years for the whole period from the Deluge to Abraham. We take then the Septuagint, and we find that the period from the Deluge to the Christian era was about 3154 years, to the fall of Rome 3630 years, and to our own day (3154 + 1876) 5030 years; the whole period since the creation being about 7287 years. We do not assert that no higher epoch than this can be obtained. As we have already said, there are orthodox writers who carry back the era of the creation much farther. Panvini gives 6311 years B.C., which would make the world, as inhabited by man, 8187 years old. But we consider the dates derived from the Septuagint as quite high enough for the purpose of our argument, and we may say, as a general conclusion, that, after examining the various systems of Biblical chronology we probably cannot safely claim for our race a much higher antiquity than 7000 or 8000 years since the creation, which places the Deluge about 5000 or 6000 years before our time.

On the other hand, it is alleged that we have reason to believe that man has been upon the earth for a period of many thousands of years antecedent to any epoch which can be derived from the Bible; that we have positive proof that he was in Western Europe 16,000, 40,000, or 200,000 years ago, and that even the highest of these figures may be far from representing the real antiquity of our race. These then are the adverse views. Let us now turn to the evidence adduced by men of science in support of their theory. It is of course only possible for us to examine the main arguments, but we shall take care to enter at some length upon the more important points.

The evidence for the alleged antiquity of man may be

* For a table of the dynasties arranged on this system, see Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i. p. 508.

† Genesis, chap. xiv.

divided into two branches, according as it is derived from (1) the contemporaneity of primitive man with the mammoth and other extinct animals; (2) the geological position and character of the strata in which specimens of rude and early human workmanship have been found. We shall consider each of these branches of our subject in turn; but before doing so we must take a brief glance at the materials which we possess for forming a judgment.

The most characteristic remains of primitive man in Western Europe consist of a series of implements of stone and bronze, and for these a classification has been generally adopted, the loose nomenclature of which contains in itself the germ of a host of fallacies. These vestiges of man's first footsteps in Europe have been divided by archaeologists into the remains of the Stone and the Bronze age, and the Stone age has again been subdivided into the Palæolithic and the Neolithic periods, the former being the period of rudely-chipped and unpolished flint implements, the latter that of polished and carefully-finished flints. The terms, age and period, are certainly to some extent calculated to mislead. When men speak of the Stone age in Europe it is often tacitly assumed that there was a definite time when stone only was in use upon the Continent, a Palæolithic being followed by a Neolithic period, and both finally yielding to an age of Bronze, while, as a fact the Stone age in Europe overlapped the Bronze, the Palæolithic, the Neolithic, and the Bronze periods melting into each other by insensible degrees in any one district, and the three ages being probably sometimes contemporary with each other, not only in adjacent countries but in different parts of the same country. And, again, if we extend our view beyond the restricted confines of Western Europe, we see that the Stone age has never ceased. It exists still throughout a large portion of the inhabited world; it has but lately ceased in many countries; it has existed within the last three centuries in many more. The Palæolithic state, the Neolithic state, and the Bronze state would be better terms, for they all three indicate, not various periods of time, but three rather ill-defined stages of civilization, which (and it is important to bear this in mind) may have often been contemporary stages within very narrow limits of space. The term "age," however, is now so well established that it would be difficult if not impossible to supersede it, yet, unless it is taken in a carefully restricted sense, it is a constant source of error.

The remains of the Stone age have been found in every part of Europe, but it is remarkable that none but the polished flints of the Neolithic period have been discovered in Ireland,

Scandinavia, and the North of Scotland. The most important discoveries have been made in the gravels and peat beds of the valley of the Somme, in the caverns of the South-west of France, in the Swiss lake-dwellings, and in the graves of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. On the question of antiquity the evidence obtained from the caves and from the valley of the Somme is the most important, and while the former chiefly illustrates that branch of the argument which rests upon the contemporaneity of man with the extinct fauna of Western Europe, the latter belongs to that portion of the evidence which derives almost all its weight from geological considerations.

The river Somme rises in the high ground near St. Quentin, and has a course of about 120 miles to the English Channel. The principal discoveries of prehistoric remains have been made in that part of the river valley which lies around and between the towns of Abbeville and Amiens. Here the valley is about a mile and a half across and two hundred feet deep. The floor of the valley is level, and, as well as the hills on each side, consists of chalk. In the lower part of it, over the chalk, there is a bed of gravel, and above this a thick deposit of peat, through which the Somme, a small stream about fifty feet wide, now has its course. On the slopes on either side of the valley there are other beds of gravel at various heights above the stream, and from the remains which they contain, as well as from the general character of the district, it is concluded that the gravels which lie highest on the slopes are the oldest, while those which lie lower down are much more recent. Thus, in the peat have been found Roman remains, iron, bronze, and polished flints of the Neolithic period; the same flints are found, but more abundantly, in the lower gravels, while the upper gravels yield recent shells of freshwater mollusca, remains of recent and extinct mammalia, including the mammoth and the rhinoceros, and relics of primitive human industry, represented by Neolithic flints and rudely-chipped but unpolished flints of the Palæolithic period. Some of these gravels lie at a level of more than seventy feet above the stream, while the lowest bed of gravel is covered with between twenty-five and thirty feet of peat, and is thus situated at a considerable depth below the Somme. Now, the partisans of the antiquity of man maintain that the present narrow river is the actual agent which excavated this wide valley. They appeal to the well-known phenomena of the gradual hollowing out by a river not only of the bed in which it flows but of the whole valley which it drains. The river is always deepening its bed, wearing away its banks, shifting its course,

laying down beds of gravel and sand in time of flood, eating its way through them again as its course changes; so that it is ever moving to right or left, and even lowering its general level, while at the same time its tributaries, and even the little runnels which form in time of rain, are hollowing out the secondary valleys and moulding and wearing down the slopes and hill-sides, and gradually evolving all the beautiful variety of our river scenery. Where no rain falls, the river hollows out its bed and lowers its level in precisely the same way, but for want of the general erosion of the surface caused by tributaries and minor watercourses, no real valley is formed, and the river flows at the bottom of a deep chasm with precipitous sides, sometimes hundreds of feet deep, as in the case of the world-famous *cañon* of the Colorado. Now, if the valley of the Somme has been excavated by the present stream as we see it to-day a shallow river, of sluggish current and only about fifty feet wide, the river leaving at different levels the gravels laid down upon the hill-slopes that were once its banks, thousands upon thousands of years must have been occupied by such a process, and if we accept this theory of the formation of the valley of the Somme, we must admit that ages have elapsed since a tribe of barbarians, armed with tools and weapons of rudely chipped flint, dwelt on its banks, and had to contend with the lions and mammoths, the rhinoceri and hippopotami that swarmed in the woods and wallowed in the river margins. But there is a second change in the valley to be taken into account. When it had been excavated to its full depth, a deposit of peat twenty-five or thirty feet thick (through which, as we have said, lies the present course of the Somme) was gradually formed on the level floor of the valley. In the gravel beneath it are found stone axes, most of them of the Neolithic type. From their position it is evident that they were dropped into the stream before the peat was formed. Now Lyell asserts that the growth of the peat must have occupied a lapse of "thousands of years," yet he remarks that the deposit contains only the remains of existing animals, "and is separated from the gravel by an interval far greater than that which divides the earliest strata of the peat from the latest"; and he further adds:—

The contrast of the fauna of the ancient alluvium (gravel and loess beds), whether at high or low levels, with the fauna of the oldest peat, is almost as great as its contrast with the existing fauna, the memorials of man being common to the whole series; hence we may infer that the interval of time which separated the era of the large extinct mammalia from that of the earliest peat was of far longer duration than that of the entire growth of the

peat. Yet we by no means need the evidence of the ancient fossil fauna to establish the antiquity of man in this part of France. The mere volume of the drift at various heights would alone suffice to demonstrate a vast lapse of time during which such heaps of shingle, derived both from the eocene and the cretaceous rocks, were thrown down in a succession of river-channels.*

On this hypothesis then, in order to ascertain the antiquity of man in the Somme valley, we have to add together (1) the ages required by a stream like the Somme to excavate the whole valley, laying down the gravel-beds in so doing; (2) the long period which separates the most recent gravel from the oldest layer of the peat, during which the mammoth became extinct; and (3) lastly the "thousands of years" required for the growth of the peat. Such is the nature of the argument with which we have to deal. Well may geologists who maintain this theory speak of the stone axes of the Somme gravels as the oldest relics of our race.

But this argument, formidable as it seems at first sight, is vitiated by a fallacy which runs through and indeed forms the basis of much of the alleged proof of the antiquity of man. We meet with it now under one phase, now under another, but it really amounts to this,—the assumption as a first principle, that all the agencies of change on and about the surface of the ground in Western Europe have always been the same, or nearly the same, as they are now. It is tacitly assumed that the growth of peat in the low-lying grounds, the increase of stalagmite in the caves, the erosion of ravines and valleys, the flow of streams and rivers, have always progressed at about the same rate as at present, and the effects they have produced within the memory of man are made the standards for the measurement of long ages of time. Here in the Somme valley we are told (1) that the valley has been excavated by a stream like the present one; (2) that the rate of growth of the peat has been always as slow as in recent times in France. We hope to show that both of these are gratuitous assumptions, that not only they are uncertain but that they are actually improbable. If we can prove this, the argument for the immense age of the flint implements of the Somme gravels falls to the ground. We shall take our facts chiefly from the vast store of well-authenticated data collected by Mr. Southall; but we shall not follow him throughout in his use of these facts, and his inferences from them; for, in discussing this part of his subject he is sometimes rather involved, his attack is in some respects weaker than than it might have been made

* "Antiquity of Man," p. 189.

with the data at his command, and in more than one instance he unwittingly misstates his adversaries' position.*

There are two questions to be examined: (1) the age of the peat, (2) the age of the gravel. Even in the lowest and most recent gravel there are found remains of the large extinct mammalia, but there are none in the peat. Now, we shall show later on that the mammoth has become extinct in Europe at no very distant period; and the fact that none of its bones have been discovered in the peat is, therefore, quite sufficient to show that it is a very recent deposit. And this conclusion is strengthened by the character of the remains which have been found at various times in it, and in the alluvial beds which form part of the same series. At Abbeville Roman glass and pottery have been found at a depth of nine feet. In May, 1854, in making a pit for a gasometer, the workmen dug up, at a depth of eighteen feet, a Roman amphora and some coins of the *Lower Empire*. At La Portelette, near Abbeville, the remains of the wooden platform of a lake-dwelling were laid bare at a depth of twelve or thirteen mètres, and at a distance of thirty mètres from the river.† Roman copper was found near Abbeville, at a depth of thirty-five feet, and a piece of iron at thirty-six feet. Finally, at various depths of from four to thirty-six feet, there were found beautifully-worked axes and knives of flint and jade, and various implements of bone and horn. The discovery of the lake-dwelling at La Portelette, at some distance from and below the level of the Somme, shows that there was once a wide sheet of water, probably an estuary or arm of the sea, occupying the site of the present peat mosses; and not only this, but it gives indications of considerable changes of level, and in this respect it by no means stands alone, for there are other indications of upheaval and subsidence in the surrounding district. The other remains appear to us

* Thus, for instance, Mr. Southall seems to think that geologists maintain that the Somme spread its waters simultaneously over the whole width of the valley during the period of excavation, and points out that this would give us a stream a mile and a half wide and less than two inches deep to do the work, which of course would be absurd; and he thus endeavours to show that the stream must have been considerably larger. We believe that it was, but on other grounds; viz., those which he himself quotes from Mr. Prestwich and Mr. A. Tylor. No geologist would make the former supposition. What they really do suggest is that the Somme flowed at various times in various parts of the valley, frequently changing its course, and, to repeat the words of Lyell, throwing down the gravel in a *series* of river-channels. Apart from the circumstances which we shall point out in our argument, there is no *prima facie* reason why the present stream should not have effected this, given a sufficient period of time.

† 1 mètre = 39.14 inches, or about 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ yard.

to show that much, if not all of the peat, is very recent, that flint implements were used (probably by the peasants) long after Roman arts had been introduced into Gaul, and even after the Roman rule had passed away. This considerably reduces the age of the peat; but we can draw more decisive evidence from the very nature of the deposit, and from the observed conditions of the growth of forest peats. On this point data obtained from the primeval forests of the great West stand Mr. Southall in good stead, and we must especially acknowledge our obligations to him for this portion of the argument. M. Boucher de Perthes remarks that the growth of the peat is so slow as to be quite imperceptible to the present inhabitants. The deposit is on an average about twenty-six feet thick, and as he estimates the increase in a century at only from one and a half to two inches, he obtains for the lowest layers of the peat an age of fully 20,000 years; and of course the underlying gravels and their contents must be still older. But there are facts which at once negative this vast antiquity. Deep in the peat beds of the Somme M. Boucher de Perthes found, still standing erect where they grew, stumps of the trees of the ancient forest in which the peat was formed. These were generally birches and alders, and other quick-growing trees, some of them a mètre (39·14 inches) high, but most of them less. Now, the experience of practical woodmen is that an oak stump will decay in a hundred years; of most other trees the stumps will have disappeared in fifty, and birch stumps are particularly perishable. Yet, if we accept M. Boucher de Perthes' theory of the slow increase of the peat beds, these birch and alder stumps must have been standing fresh and undecayed in the growing peat for a period of from 1900 to 2600 years before they were covered up and protected from the weather. This, of course, would be impossible; but, besides their negative force, these facts give us some positive information to which Mr. Southall would perhaps have given more prominence but that his criticism is throughout destructive rather than constructive. The peat must have, at least in some places, gained *a full mètre in less than a century*.* Now, if we suppose that this is the maximum, and take the average growth in a century at about one foot, or less than one-third of a mètre, we obtain for the age of the peat about 2600 years. The valley is now under cultivation and no peat accumulates in it, but it is difficult to

* This is confirmed by another fact. "There were," says Mr. Southall, "prostrate trunks of oak in the peat four feet in diameter, and so sound that they were manufactured into furniture. They must have been covered by the peat in a hundred years."—"Recent Origin of Man," p. 270.

ascertain when the growth of the peat ceased. Certain it is that it has increased considerably since the Roman period, for, as we have seen, Roman remains have been found at a depth of six mètres—more than eighteen feet.* But if we suppose that no peat has accumulated within the last 400 years, we get for the total age of the oldest peat-beds about 3000 years, which fixes their epoch at least 2000 years after the Deluge, and about 400 years before the epoch of the foundation of Rome. It is not unlikely that even this is too high an estimate. It is based on the facts ascertained by Professor Andrews, of Chicago, as to the growth of forest peats—and detailed by Mr. Southall—the approximate date is our own. We do not lay any further stress on it than to use it to show that this portion of the evidence is quite consistent with the recent origin of man.

We now turn to the second branch of the argument—that which relates to the gravels of the Somme. Except in the case of the very lowest beds, these deposits are of course older than the peat, but their claim to the remote antiquity which has been assigned to them is more than doubtful. As we have already seen, the argument for such an antiquity amounts to this, that the valley has been excavated by the present river, which has deposited the gravels at various levels in two distinct series or terraces, with a chalk escarpment cropping out between them, the upper gravels being the oldest, the lower beds the most recent, and the valley having been excavated by gradual denudation to the depth of fifty feet during the long period which is alleged to have elapsed between the epochs of the two series of gravels.

The geological data on which this theory is based are disputed by a very competent authority, Mr. Alfred Tylor, F.G.S., who has given considerable attention to the subject of the formation of river valleys and their deposits generally, and to the valley of the Somme in particular. Mr. Southall's work has been the means of calling our attention to Mr. Tylor's papers on the subject in the "Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society," and though we do not accept some of his theories, no one can question the value of his survey† of the levels and deposits of the Somme valley obtained in 1867, which placed at his disposal an array of accurate data such as had not been at the command of Lyell and Prestwich. From these data he has deduced arguments which go far to

* This gives a rate of increase of *more than a foot* in a century.

† The levels of this survey were taken by M. Guilloin, Chief Engineer of the Northern Railway of France.

show that the gravels of the Somme are of very recent date. Mr. Tylor's argument is based on such an array of details, that to make a satisfactory summary of it would be all but impossible. We shall, therefore, merely quote his conclusions in his own words, and briefly develop some of the considerations to which they seem to point:—

First, that the surface of the chalk in the valley of the Somme had assumed its present form prior to the deposition of any of the gravel or loess now to be seen there, and in this respect corresponds with all other valleys in which quaternary deposits are to be met with.

This strikes at the very foundation of the theory of the remote age of the gravels, the chief argument for which is based on the belief that the valley was excavated to a depth of fifty feet subsequent to the deposition of the oldest gravel:—

Second, that the whole of the Amiens valley gravel is of one formation, and of similar mineral character, and contains nearly similar organic contents the whole deposit being of a date not much antecedent to the historical period.

Third, that the gravel in the valley of the Somme at Amiens is partly derived from the *débris* brought down by the river Somme, and by the two rivers, the Celle and the Arve, and partly consists of material from the adjoining higher grounds washed in by land floods.

This gives the key to the theory which Mr. Tylor proposes to substitute for that of Lyell and Boucher de Perthes. He insists that the gravel-beds of the Somme were laid down by enormous floods in a rainy period which immediately preceded the historical period:—

The quaternary gravels of the Somme (he says) are not separated into two divisions by an escarpment of chalk parallel to the river The St. Acheul gravels thin out gradually as they slope from the high land down to the Somme, and they pass away into the loess formation The loess deposit, on the contrary, forms a distinct escarpment for many miles along the Somme; and this, I believe, is the bank of the ancient river whose floods produced the St. Achéul and Montiers gravels.

Fifthly (he concludes), that the existence of river floods, extending to a height of at least eighty feet above the present level of the Somme, is perfectly proved by the gradual slope and continuity of the gravels deposited by those floods upon the sloping side of the valley towards the Somme, and also by the loess or warp of similar mineral composition and colour, extending continuously over the whole series of gravels, and finishing with a well-defined bank near the present stream.*

Mr. Prestwich, though he is a champion of Lyell's views,

* "Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society," May, 1868 (vol. xxiv.).

gives some support to the chief part of Mr. Tylor's theory, in a passage quoted by Mr. Southall, in which he says that the Somme was in the prehistoric period:—

A shallow and broad river, with numerous, generally dry, shoals and shingle-banks; but during floods, arising from the melting of the winter snows and a greater rainfall than the present day, rising to a height of forty or fifty feet above its ordinary level, flooding the adjacent country, and depositing, out of the course of the main current, the fine silt now forming the loess.

Once we have floods such as these, it is not difficult to imagine that they deposited not the loess only, but the gravel-beds also, and some of the masses of stone these beds contain are so great that it is difficult to see how anything but floods could have placed them in their present position. Much might be said of the power of floods, even in a level country. Mr. Tylor gives a good example. In the rainy season of 1866 an iron railway bridge over the Mulleer river, sixteen miles above Kurrachee, was destroyed by a flood. The girders of the bridge were sixty-four feet above high-water mark at Kurrachee harbour, the Mulleer, flowing through a flat country, was about a foot deep the day before the flood. But twenty-four hours of rain brought down such a flood that the bridge was swept away, and one of its girders, weighing eighty tons, was carried two miles down the river and buried in a bed of sand. We may safely conclude then that there is no scientific improbability in the theory that the gravels of the Somme were laid down by floods *after the excavation of the valley*, and not gradually deposited by the stream during that excavation. It was after the cessation of this period of floods, when the climate had become less humid and more temperate, that woods and thickets of quick-growing trees—alders and willows—sprung up on the marshy margins of the stream, and spread up the slopes towards the higher ground. In these woods were formed the peat-beds of the Somme. During this period, too, and even at a later date, it would seem that there was more than one change of level. There are signs of upheaval between Abbeville and Amiens, and there is some evidence that the elevation of the coast has changed, even within the historical period, and that a broad estuary once ran up to Abbeville. On these points, however, our data are uncertain. But that there was some changes of level is abundantly clear from the discovery of the remains of a lake-dwelling at La Portelette, thirty-six feet below the present surface-level of the stream, for the platform of this structure must once have been above water.

Let us now see how our conclusions with regard to primitive man in the Somme valley adapt themselves to the recorded history of mankind. We shall endeavour to show—(1) that such a concordance can be established; (2) that the teachings of modern physical science make the recent more probable than the remote origin of man. We have already remarked that there has been throughout more attention given to what we have called the destructive criticism of our adversaries' position, than to attempts to construct from the ascertained facts of prehistoric archæology a scheme of the history of primitive man which will accord with the known facts of revelation and of well-authenticated human history. In other words, writers on the orthodox side of this question have dwelt too much upon the negative portion of their argument, to the neglect of the positive element which must necessarily form a part of it before it is complete. Even Mr. Southall's book, excellent as it is, fails to a great extent in this respect. Before proceeding further, then, we shall endeavour to sketch a sort of outline of what we consider must have been the history of man in the district of the Somme. We do not attach any further importance to it than what belongs to a necessarily imperfect attempt to indicate the main lines of the concord which further knowledge will assuredly demonstrate between the facts related in the sacred records, the leading dates of ancient history, and the inferences which may be deduced from the results of modern research into the obscure unwritten history of the days when the earth was young.

We have already seen that we may place the epoch of the Deluge at about 5000 years before the present time, and that the approximate age of the oldest peat-beds of the Somme need not be estimated at more than 3000 years. Thus we have a period of fully 2000 years between these two epochs—a period which would carry us back from our own time to the palmy days of the Roman republic. A thousand years after the Deluge, as we have already seen, Abraham found a Pharaoh reigning in Egypt.* It is not unreasonable to suppose that 500 years still later there were Iberian, if not Celtic, tribes to be found in Western Europe. In the primitive period the population must necessarily have been very thinly scattered, like that of most wild countries in the present day. The tribes, too, that peopled Western Europe must necessarily have been far inferior in civilization to the races from which they had separated, if for no other reason, because they were

* Genesis, chap. xii.

probably driven westward by more powerful peoples. We always find the older and conquered races inhabiting the extremities of countries and continents. We have ready instances of this in our own islands, in the people of Connaught, who are probably a Firbolg race who were driven over the Shannon by the Milesians, and in the Welsh the relics of the races that had to yield the fairer portion of the land to the Saxons. But in earlier times this must have been still more the case, and the men who first entered the valley of the Somme, whether they were Celts, or belonged to that earlier Iberian race of which we have a remnant in the Basques, these men had been driven by stronger tribes westward and northward into what was then a primeval wilderness. And let it be borne in mind that in rude times a conquered tribe is a ruined tribe—it has lost tools, arms, tents, cooking utensils, all but what can be carried in the hand or slung over the shoulder in the headlong flight from enemies that slay all they overtake. Is it surprising then to find that these bands of wandering hunters, by the time that they had been pushed into Gaul, had lost the use of metals, and had to depend entirely upon wood and stone for their arms and tools? But it is not necessary to suppose that they were in any sense more degraded than many of the savages of our own day—they may have been far above the level of some—for instance, of the wretched people of Patagonia or of Tierra del Fuego. That they used rough stone tools does not imply that they had no other implements, for the savage can often manufacture very serviceable weapons, tools, and agricultural implements of wood. But, in any case, they had lost all but the dim traces of a primitive civilization. We may imagine them, generation after generation, living for some centuries a precarious and toilsome life. Probably their chief camping-grounds would be among the woods upon the heights; but the fact that the river was subject to floods would not prevent them from occupying to some extent even the lower slopes. The climate appears to have been in these remote times very different from what it is at present, and subject to periods of heavy rain, which swelled the Somme till it flooded all the lower portion of the valley. The hippopotamus swam in the stream; the mammoth, the lion, and the rhinoceros came down from the woods to drink its waters, and with all these the wild hunters, armed with the stone celt, arrow, and spear, contended successfully, even as the savage of to-day contends with their modern representatives; for man everywhere asserts his old dominion over the brute, and bulk and strength count for but little against his intelligence and his power of combination

and ingenious contrivance. At first sight it seems strange to think that these huge beasts may have been living with men in northern Gaul within the last 4,000 years, but we shall see presently that it is far from improbable.

Gradually the climate became more temperate, floods were lower and less frequent, the large mammalia became scarce and then died out; the lower portions of the valley were covered with alders and willows, and in the marshy levels under this quick growth of small tress, the forest peats were forming. In the gravel-beds that marked the range of former floods were buried relics of those early days, tools, and the bodies of men and animals swept away by the floods. In the gravel too would be the graves of the various tribes, generation after generation burying the warrior and hunter where his house had stood, and laying his weapons of stone beside him. In process of time the bones would decay, and with them the wooden shaft of the spear, or the short stout handle of the stone axe or celt, and nothing would be left but the indestructible stone. More of these remains would be buried in the peat of the river margins, and with them later on would be found the relics of the days when, after the valley had been occupied for fully 1500 years, the Romans pushed their posts beyond the Somme, and their galleys floated on the broad estuary that probably then ran up to Abbeville. There is ample time for all these changes in the period we have named. Even a thousand years is a length of time that we cannot well realize, except by the changes it has produced. Glance back to the year 877, what was Europe then? Are not its woods, its rivers, its coast, all changed, as well as its people? It is hard for us, who know England as it is now, to imagine that a thousand years ago the Danish war-ships could sail over the flooded fens to the sack of Lincoln or Ely, and that many a square mile of English land was a pathless wood or untrodden waste; that, in fact, nearly all the country was a wilderness, except where a few hundred cultivated acres spread around the abbey, the manor, or the town that we should now call a hamlet or a village. Or look across the Atlantic, and see the changes of less than four hundred years. In that time a whole continent has been seized and occupied by a new race, and of the old peoples two powerful empires—those of the Incas and the Aztecs—have been swept away, and the descendants of the civilized races of Mexico and Peru have been reduced almost to the condition of savages. No, we do not realize sufficiently the changes recorded by history, and we are too much inclined to assign long thousands of years to those which took place before the historic period.

We have said that man was probably the contemporary of the mammoth in France, within the last four thousand years. We now proceed to draw from Mr. Southall's work some facts in support of this opinion. It is well known that the men of the caves must have been contemporary with the mammoth, for, apart from other evidence, there is a piece of ivory from the cave of Les Eyzies in the Dordogne, on which some primitive artist has rudely but unmistakably sketched the bold outline of the mammoth, with his curved tusks, high shoulders, and long waving mane.* This has been alleged as a proof of the remote origin of man, but it proves nothing until we are perfectly sure of the remote age of the mammoth; and if we have good reason to believe that man is of recent origin, it will only go to prove that the mammoth survived to a much later period than till lately any geologist was disposed to allow.

The evidence for the existence of the mammoth down to a comparatively recent period is briefly as follows: In the first place it is certain that many of the large mammalia which were its contemporaries are identical or almost identical with existing species. Mr. Boyd Dawkins identifies the cave-lion (*Felis spelæa*), that once ranged the woods and heaths of England, with the African lion of to-day. M. Gervais identifies the cave-bear with the brown bear of Europe; the countless remains of horses at Solutré do not differ from those of the horse of to-day in any essential feature. "The cave-hyæna," says Sir John Lubbock, "is now regarded as scarcely distinguishable specifically from the spotted hyæna of Southern Africa." Other animals now extinct, or at least extinct in Europe, must have lived down to medieval times. Cæsar and Sallust speak of the reindeer as existing in their times in Germany; and from a passage in a contemporary author it would appear that it was hunted in the valley of the Rhine as late as A.D. 600. It was found in Scotland in the twelfth century, and in Prussia in the fourteenth. The Irish elk, a gigantic animal, ten feet high, and with broad flat spreading horns, often eleven feet from tip to tip, must have lingered in Western Europe, and especially in Ireland, to a very late period. A leg of the elk, with portions of the tendons, skin, and hair upon it, was found in Wexford in 1864: its bones have been found associated with iron in Ireland and pottery in Switzerland; and the book of Lismore speaks of the chase of the *great*

* Many of the published figures of this incised drawing of the mammoth convey very little idea of the original; but the lithographic plate in Christy and Lartet's "*Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ*" (London, 1867—1875) is an accurate reproduction. This splendid work is a perfect museum of the prehistoric antiquities of the South-west of France.

black deer, a description which will apply to no living species. The Urus (*Bos primigenius*) has only been extinct 200 years; the aurochs, or European bison, is still found in the Caucasus. All these animals were the contemporaries of the mammoth, and if they have survived to our own time, or to a period which can be measured by less than a thousand years, is it so very improbable that the mammoth was living in Europe, say 2500 or 3000 years ago?

But we have some direct testimony which bears upon this point. In the frozen *tundras* or bogs of Siberia the mammoth has been found with the food unchanged in its stomach, and blood still in its capillaries; the tusks, which are collected in hundreds, are almost as fresh as recent Indian ivory; and this is the case too with many mammoth tusks found in Europe: one splendid tusk dredged up a few years ago in the North Sea was actually sold to some turners by the fishermen, and used by them for manufacturing purposes. Frequently, too, bones are found retaining a large proportion of animal matter. In America we have unequivocal evidence of the recent age of the near ally of the mammoth, the mastodon. Its bones have been found with beneath them a kind of matting of split canes. Everywhere the mammoth and the mastodon remains are found in the superficial deposits. In both Siberia and America traditions of huge elephantine animals still linger. Their forms are carved in the old Aztec cities of central America, and among the prehistoric *bronzes* of Siberia there is a cast of an animal whose heavy elephant-like form and curving tusks are singularly suggestive of the mammoth. We have nowhere here anything that amounts to positive proof of our position, but we believe any one who carefully weighs this evidence cannot fail to see that its tendency is to bring the epoch of the extinction of the great mammalia, and with them of the mammoth and the mastodon, within a comparatively recent period. That we should have had no oral or written tradition of the mammoth in Europe is not surprising, when we consider that it must have become extinct when there were no written records, and that the memory of extinct animals soon dies out. But for a single passage in Herodotus we should never have known that the lion ranged over what is now European Turkey in the days of Xerxes; and there are districts in Asia where the lion has become extinct within the last hundred years, and is now utterly forgotten.

We have seen then (1) that the age of the peat in the Somme valley has been very much exaggerated; (2) that Mr. Tylor's researches tend to show that the same is the case with the gravel-beds, and that the gravels are of a date subsequent

to the excavation of the valley; (3) and that, consequently, there is no need to assign to man an existence in immensely remote periods in the valley of the Somme. Again, we have seen that the probability that man was contemporary with the mammoth and the larger prehistoric mammalia can be explained equally well by assigning a recent date to the extinction of the mammoth, as by attributing a remote origin to man. It would appear, therefore, that geologists have exaggerated the periods necessary for the most recent changes which have taken place upon our planet; and more than this, we have actual proof that they have greatly exaggerated the duration of the whole period during which life has existed on earth. We notice this here with a view to suggesting what we believe is a perfectly new argument on the recent origin of man. Mr. Southall and the other writers on the subject, so far as we are aware, have not brought to bear upon it the recent scientific results which we now propose should be made to throw some light upon this intricate question. The argument (like all others on both sides of the subject) is only an approximation to proof, but we maintain that it greatly strengthens the scientific probability of the position assumed by those who assign, as we do, to man a life-period on earth of less than 10,000 years. The argument is briefly this:—The remains and the works of man are only found in the recent and superficial deposits. Ardent geologists have talked of an eocene man, or of the hope of some day finding evidence of man's existence at even an earlier period; but not a trace of such evidence has yet been discovered; and while man's works are confined to these beds and layers of gravel, peat, sand, and stalagmite, system after system of fossiliferous rocks show us life extending back for ages upon ages till we see its dawn in the Laurentian rocks of Canada. We have here two periods,—the life-period of the earth (i.e. of all life on earth) and the life-period of the human race; and it is quite clear that the disproportion between the greater of these periods and the less is enormous. Whether the period in which man has inhabited the earth be assumed to be short or long, it is but a brief interval of time compared to the ages during which the earth has "brought forth the green herb, . . . and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after its kind, . . . and the living creature in its kind, cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." If the silent records of the rocks have proved anything, they have proved this. Now geologists have assigned to this life-period of the earth such periods as two or three hundred million years. Lyell gives 200,000,000 years as the period which must have elapsed since the deposition of the secondary strata.

At this rate 300 millions of years must fall below the corresponding estimate for the period of all life on earth; and 200,000 years, the approximate life-period assigned to man, is therefore taken as considerably less than one-thousandth part of the life-period of the earth. Let us suppose that this approximately represents the probable proportion between the two periods. This is the first step gained.

But physical science, with the help of mathematics, tells us how long it has been possible for the earth to have been inhabited by life such as we see it at present,—life such as we trace it in the fossiliferous strata. The modern doctrine of energy and force applied to this question gives us a ready and a certain answer. The subject was taken up by Sir William Thomson within the last few years. We cannot give here even a résumé of his arguments; we can only notice the result. But a popular exposition of Sir William Thomson's investigation will be found in Professor Tait's "*Recent Advances in Physical Science*";* there is a fuller treatment of the subject in an article on "*Geological Time*"† in the "*North British Review*" for July, 1869; and it was referred to during the last meeting of the British Association at Glasgow.

Sir William Thomson divides his argument into three branches. (1) That based on the internal heat of the earth; (2) based on the tidal retardation of the earth's rotation; (3) based on the sun's temperature. The general nature of the proof will be understood when we say that in the first branch he takes what we know of the internal heat of the earth and the known laws of the cooling of heated bodies, and from what we know of the heat of the earth at present and the rate at which it is cooling calculates back to the time when its surface first solidified, and when it became fit for animal and vegetable life. Ten million years is thus found to be the limit during which life has been possible on earth. To sum the matter up in Professor Tait's words:—

We can say at once to geologists that, granting this premiss—that physical laws have remained as they are now, and that we know of all the physical laws which have been operating during that time, we cannot give more time for their speculations than about ten or (say at most) fifteen million years. But I dare say many of you are acquainted with the speculations of Lyell and others, especially of Darwin, who tells us that even for a comparatively brief portion of recent geological history three hundred millions of years will

* London and Cambridge, 1876, p. 165, &c.

† We believe that this article was also from the pen of Professor Tait.

not suffice. We say, so much the worse for geology as at present understood by its chief authorities, for, as you will presently see, physical considerations from various independent points of view, render it utterly impossible that more than ten or fifteen million years can be granted.*

He then proceeds to the other branches of the argument. For these we must refer our readers to the authorities already stated. We have here the result, a result not yet accepted by geologists, for there is a scientific prejudice which is quite as powerful as the theological prejudice of which we hear so much; but this result they must accept sooner or later, for it is a case of close mathematical reasoning against loose speculation. Its acceptance will revolutionize geology, for it will afford no time for the exaggerated uniformitarianism of the school of Lyell, a school which has never been popular among continental geologists. It will deal a severe blow to Darwinism, for 10,000,000 years is but a narrow interval for the operations of natural selection and evolution. But we have not to deal with these considerations here. We return to the argument.

We have seen that while life has existed on earth for ages, the life-period of the human race, is allowed by geologists themselves to be a short interval compared to what we have called the life-period of the earth; and, taking estimates actually given by geologists, we find that the less period is not equal to as much as one thousandth part of the greater. This proportion must hold good whether man has been a short time or a long time on earth, whether life has existed on our planet for 300 or 400 million years, or for no more than 10,000,000. But we now know that life has not existed on earth for more than 15,000,000 years, and that probably it has existed for less than 10,000,000 years. It follows, then, that man has not been on earth for 15,000 years, and that probably the life-period of man is, as we have said, *considerably less than 10,000 years*. This is all but demonstrated. As for man having been 200,000 years on earth; if so, he has been on earth not for $\frac{1}{10000}$ †, but for $\frac{1}{75}$ of the whole life-period of the earth, a proportion which every known fact of geology condemns. We might have elaborated the argument at much

* "Recent Advances in Physical Science," pp. 167, 168.

† The question here is entirely one of the proportion between the two periods. When we state the ratio approximately at $\frac{1}{10000}$, we take the "life period of the earth" at a lower figure than geologists really claim for it, but the higher the figure the stronger the argument, for the greater is the disproportion. There is, however, no need for detail in the matter, as the figures are really throughout very rough approximations.

greater length, but this is sufficient. Geologists have enormously exaggerated the period during which life has existed on earth: this is actually and strictly proved. They have also exaggerated the period during which man has been on earth: this is all but proved, and this is a subject on which we need only establish probability. There is not one single point of the opposing view for which strict demonstration can be given. If we can show that the recent, as opposed to the remote origin of man, is scientifically probable, enough will be gained, and we believe it is possible to do more than this. It is this that we have endeavoured to show in this article.

As a fact, what can be more reasonable than the account of man's origin given by the Bible? Naked, weak, without natural arms of defence or offence, his life must have begun in a warm climate, where food could be easily procured—in other words, in a terrestrial paradise. This is what human reason tells us; we know, of course, that man's state in Eden was something infinitely higher than this condition of mere bodily security and comfort. When he fell from his first high estate, he did not sink to the level of the savage, for, from many points of view, we obtain evidences of a primitive patriarchal civilization. We cannot go into this point now at any length; but it is remarkable that we find no stone age in the East; that it seems to have been from the earliest period the seat of civilized people; that it is only as the waves of population spread outward from this centre northward and westward and southward, that the decline from civilization to barbarism begins. Far easier is this decline than the much talked-of progress from a primitive barbarism to higher and higher levels. Do we know of any nation that ever advanced from barbarism to civilization, except under external influences? This is true of the nations of Europe, so far as we can trace their history; of the origin of the old civilization of Greece and Rome we know but little, but that little indicates an Eastern origin, and the oldest records of the East are records of civilized states. Of the rapid decline of civilization we have evidence enough. What has become of the civilization of ancient Egypt, of northern Africa? In three hundred years the civilization of Mexico and of Peru has disappeared. We might develop the idea still further, but its full treatment would require a separate article.

That primitive man was often in a state far above that of existing savages is abundantly shown by the discoveries made in the lake-dwellings. That primitive conditions have survived to our own day is proved by every collection of the weapons and implements of savage tribes. The Stone age

still exists in Polynesia, and within the arctic circle. There is a race of wretched cave-dwellers in Ceylon. Herodotus described a lake-dwelling existing in his day on Lake Prasias in Thrace; on the very same lake in our own day there is a lake-dwelling inhabited by a few fishermen. While here in England we are living in the midst of a luxurious civilization, the savage hunter is chipping out his arrowheads of flint, or shaping his fishing-hook of bone. Is it difficult to imagine then that while the Grecian fleet lay before Troy, while Saul or David reigned in Israel, the dwellers on the Somme were flint-armed hunters clad in the shaggy hides of the beasts they had hunted down? The *fellaheen* of Egypt are descended from the men who built the Pyramids; their greatest architectural feat is now the erection of a mud-built hovel: is it unreasonable then to suppose that these hunters of the Somme were the descendants of men who had once known the use of metals? Yet, it is a common thing for scientific men to treat the remote origin of the human race and its primitive barbarism as actually demonstrated, while, as a fact, they are not proved; and if anything, scientific and historical probabilities point in the opposite direction. We shall, perhaps, never obtain actual proof on this point; but if we do, we shall assuredly find that man sprung not from races of wretched anthropoid beings hardly distinguishable from the beasts, dwelling on this earth hundreds of thousands of years ago, and gradually finding out how to utter a word, and to roughly shape a stone into a tool; but that his life began not many thousands of years ago, when the first man and the first woman came forth perfect from the hands of God; and when they fell, the mercy that spared them to life and reason did not degrade them into a hideous barbarism: something of the knowledge of Eden still remained; man from the first had dominion over the cattle and every living thing; sin, and rapine and violence did indeed before long sink the human race, in many a land deeper and deeper into barbarism, or into a still lower depth,—the polished pagan civilization, that concealed a festering mass of corruption. But man was still man, waiting for the Messiah his deliverer. We have found no relic, even of the earliest races, that tells us he was aught else but man; and even the oldest skulls from the caves show us the same head, the forehead, the face, unchanged in any essential feature. Men with a perverse ingenuity are striving to disprove all that is noble in man's origin. They have denied God, and now we may say they are striving to deny man; that is to say, to deny everything in man that would imply that he came from God. But, with all their pertinacity,

as yet they have proved nothing, and the only effect of the controversy will be to set in a clearer light the truth of the simple but sublime record of man's origin related by an inspired pen in the first pages of the book of Genesis.

ART. V.—THE STUDY OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi: Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des Europäischen Mittelalters, von 375–1500. Vollständiges Inhaltsverzeichniss zu Acta Sanctorum der Bollandisten. Anhang: Quellenkunde für die Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten während des Mittelalters, von AUGUST POTTHAST. Berlin, 1862.

Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi: Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des Europäischen Mittelalters, von 375–1500. Supplement nebst einer Zeitfolge der Römischen Päpste, der Deutschen Kaiser und Könige, sowie sämtlicher Deutschen Bischöfe, von AUGUST POTTHAST. Berlin, 1868.

IT would probably not be very inaccurate if we were to describe the sets of notions which so largely go to make up the political and religious creeds of the vast majority of people, as traditions fortified by watchwords. The ideas which we unconsciously imbibe from others are held much more tenaciously than those which come to us as the mere results, more or less probable, of our private study and meditation. We cling to them as first principles, and guard them with shibboleths.

And this is true of men in the mass as much as of man in the individual. The traditions of a country, or an age, ever spread their roots widely, and whether true or false, salutary or baneful, are most difficult to eradicate. It is as hard to argue with a prejudice as to answer a sneer, and a received tradition is, in the strictest sense of the word, a prejudice, a judging without examination of evidence, or rather, an acceptance of the common judgment of society, a rough-and-ready application of the maxim, "*Res judicata pro veritate accipitur*"; and the strength of its hold upon the popular mind is not in the least affected by its correctness or incorrectness, which is a further question.

Perhaps one of the most signal instances of the power of tradition is supplied by the conception which prevailed almost universally throughout Europe, from the beginning of the sixteenth century to well nigh the end of the eighteenth,

as to the character of the medieval period. The almost total neglect and absolute discredit to which the Renaissance consigned the centuries intervening between itself and the fall of Paganism, is one of the most singular phenomena of history. As a matter of fact, "nearly all the inventions and social institutions whereby we yet live as civilized men were originated or perfected in"* those centuries; but men shut their eyes to this fact. The prevailing tradition was that they were a "millennium of darkness," a period of mere savagery and ignorance, in which the sun of civilization was under an eclipse—a "misty time," an "uncivil age," as Sir Philip Sidney† speaks, overhung with "dust and cobwebs." And from his time to almost within our own day, their "dust and cobwebs" remained undisturbed; their history, if investigated at all, was approached with prepossessions fatal to intelligent study,‡ and was regarded as a barren field, worthy only of the musty toils of antiquarianism, which, according to Bishop Warburton, "is to true letters what specious funguses are to the oak";§ their institutions were misunderstood and were ignorantly condemned; even the monuments of their art, on which, as it would seem to us, the evidence of their greatness is written in unmistakable characters, shared in the contempt which was poured upon them. Not much more than a century ago one of the literary chiefs of the day, writing of the most glorious of English churches, observes that "its external appearance cannot but be displeasing to the eye of every man who has any idea of propriety or proportion, even although he may be ignorant of architecture as a science";|| and this judgment of York Minster is correct enough, according to the canons of criticism then prevailing. Indeed, it was

* Carlyle, "Miscellaneous Essays," vol. ii. p. 328.

† "Defence of Poesy," pp. 62 and 46 (Arber's reprint).

‡ Thus Gibbon, as Mr. Leslie Stephen remarks, "regards all creeds, political and religious, as *from the outside*. He examines the evidence for the facts with judicial severity,"—and something more, we may add, when Christianity is concerned,—"but is quite incapable of sharing or appreciating the passions of which the facts were the outward symbol. . . . A long series of historical figures passes before us in his stately pages, but they resemble the masks in a funeral procession." Still, notwithstanding these radical faults, we agree with Mr. Stephen, that "his book is the first triumph of a true historical method."—"English Thought in the 18th Century," vol. i. p. 447.

§ "Letters to Hurd," l. lxix.

|| Smollett's Works, vol. xi. p. 246, edition 1824. So in his "Travels through France and Italy," he remarks, "The implements of Popish superstition, such as relics of pretended saints, ill-proportioned spires and belfries, and the nauseous repetition of the figure of the cross, which is in itself a very mean and disagreeable object, only fit for the prisons of condemned criminals, have contrived to introduce a vicious taste into the external architecture, as well as the internal ornaments of our temples" (vol. x. p. 295).

fortunate when the taste of the age contented itself with mere verbal expressions of its dislike of the priceless relics of mediæval art. Too frequently such sentiments were translated into action, to the irreparable loss of future generations. Thus, in the centre of the Christian world the very piety of the Pontiffs was converted into an instrument of destruction, and august sanctuaries underwent a process of transformation, fatal alike to their pristine beauty and to their historical associations. Even the venerable Lateran Basilica did not escape. The alterations of Borromini and the additions of Galilei have so completely destroyed the original character of the "mother and mistress of all the churches," that it is now most difficult for us to figure to ourselves the edifice which Clement V. restored and which Giotto decorated. Nor was it only to the architectural glories of the Middle Ages that this process was applied. The "lofty rhyme," in which so many generations of saints had enshrined their highest aspirations and their deepest experiences, was stretched upon the Procrustean bed of classical metre, and was hopelessly mangled and mutilated to satisfy the tyrannical requirements of the dominant fashion. The plain song of the Catholic Church was happier than her hymns, inasmuch as it was the object of deeper contempt, and, by utter neglect, escaped "reformation." Painting fared no better than the sister arts. The works of the great masters of the mediæval schools were abandoned to dishonour and decay. They were without meaning for generations who could conceive of no sublimer mission for a painter than to minister to the senses by the delineation of the visible; whose highest artistic aspirations were satisfied by the pompous inanities of the *Maniéristes*, the pretty imbecilities of the *Paysagistes*, or the vulgar trivialities of the *Genristes*.

These were some of the evidences and fruits of the great tradition as to the darkness and barbarism of the Middle Ages which so long maintained an undisputed reign throughout Europe. The first attempt at questioning its sway may perhaps be traced to that dilettante school of which the most considerable representatives in England were Horace Walpole and Gray; men whose genuine though ill-instructed admiration of the monuments of "Gothic" architecture (to use their own phrase) entitles them to our respect, and whose earnest protests against the "rage of repairing, beautifying, whitewashing, painting, and gilding, which threatened to be little less fatal"*

* See Gray's Letter to the Rev. Mr. Bentham, "*Works*," vol. iv. p. 74 (Pickering's edition).

to those venerable structures "than the Reformation and the Civil Wars," merit our warmest gratitude. It is observable, however, that nothing like a serious study of the mediæval period seems to have been dreamt of even by Gray. He delights, indeed, in Froissart; so delights in him, he says* in one of his letters, that at one time he "can read nothing else," but he is evidently half-ashamed of his devotion to this "Herodotus of a barbarous age."† So Percy, who did excellent service by publishing his "Reliques," when dedicating the volume to the Countess of Northumberland, speaks deprecatingly of them as the "barbarous productions of unpolished ages," "that had been almost lost to memory had not the gallant deeds of" that lady's "illustrious ancestors preserved them from oblivion." Percy's "Reliques," which appeared in 1765, were not at first highly appreciated by English critics, but in Germany they obtained a great and speedy success through the labours of Bürger and other translators and imitators.‡ Eight years afterwards a far more significant indication of the breaking up of the old Renaissance tradition proceeded from a young law-student of Frankfort, who was destined in later years to exercise an unrivalled influence over the higher thought of Europe, and to occupy, by an unquestioned title, its intellectual throne. Goethe's first work, "Gotz von Berlichingen," was given to the world in 1773, and, as Mr. Carlyle has justly remarked, "it stands prominent among the causes, or at the very least among the signals, of a great change in modern literature."§ Not only was it "the parent of an innumerable progeny of chivalry plays, feudal delineations, and poetico-antiquarian performances," in its own country, but it aroused the genius of Sir Walter Scott, whose first literary enterprise was a translation of it, and may thus, in some sense, be regarded as the beginning of the romanticist school, of which his is still the most popular and indeed the greatest name. Scott's romances of chivalry, whether metrical or prose, are indeed far enough from being true pictures of the times in which their scene is laid. He is the most charming of story-tellers: he realized vividly the picturesque

* Vol. v. p. 116. See, also, vol. iii. p. 230.

† Vol. iv. p. 190.

‡ See Wordsworth's Essay, in vol. vi. of Moxon's Centenary edition of his Works, p. 373. "Germany is much indebted to Percy's 'Reliques,'" Wordsworth remarks; "and, for our own country, its poetry has been absolutely redeemed by it. I do not think there is an able writer in verse of the present day, who would not be proud to acknowledge his obligations to the 'Reliques'; and for myself, I am happy on this occasion to make a public avowal of my own" (p. 377).

§ "Miscel." vol. i. p. 341.

aspects of the age of chivalry, and he used them most effectively to colour his narratives. It is an ungracious task to use language sounding like disparagement with regard to compositions which have so strong a claim on our gratitude as the delight of boyhood, and the solace of many an hour of ennui or pain in maturer life. Still it must be confessed that, if tried by a severe standard, and apart from the circumstances of the age when they were given to the world, all the praise that can honestly be bestowed upon them ends here. Their knights and barons and abbots no more resemble the real warriors and churchmen of the Middle Ages than Fonthill Abbey resembles a medieval religious house. But Fonthill Abbey is not without its merits, and, like the "*Waverley Novels*," it marks an immense advance upon the age of "*Strawberry Hill*" and the "*Castle of Otranto*." Superficial, however, as Sir Walter Scott's sketches of the medieval period are in themselves, they were of immense service in awakening public interest in that period, and have been fruitful in results the practical importance of which it is not easy to overrate. "The general want of something deeper and more attractive than what had offered itself elsewhere," remarks one who speaks with peculiar authority on this matter, "may be considered to have led to his popularity, and by means of his popularity he reacted on his readers, stimulating their mental thirst, feeding their hopes, setting before them visions, which, when once seen, are not easily forgotten."* Another writer less widely popular, but of far higher claims than Scott, was at the same time exerting a vast influence in the same direction over the most cultivated minds of his day. The poems of Wordsworth are full of evidence of how deeply he felt the spell of the ages of faith, how his strong poetic vision, piercing through the cloud of misconceptions which had so long encompassed them, discerned, at all events in outline, the tokens of their true greatness and glory.

Scott, then, and Wordsworth are conspicuous among the instruments and evidences of the decline of the old evil tradition regarding the medieval period. It was, however, reserved for the religious movement, of which F. Newman† reckons them the precursors, to give a more effective blow to it. That great movement was indeed fatal to many of the traditions of which Oxford had been the stronghold. Fresh intellectual and spiritual life stirred among the dry bones of that splendid sepulchre of medieval faith after the torpor

* J. H. Newman's "*Essays, Crit. and Hist.*," vol. i. p. 267.

† *Ibid.*

of the last century, and the idols of frigid Anglicanism and dull Toryism, which under the formula of "Church and State," had so long been venerated as the *genii loci*, were openly pronounced by ardent spirits to be no gods. "Confractus est Bel; contritus est Nabo." The Martyrs' Memorial may truly be described as a monument to the memory of a cultus which had passed away. Curiously enough, this essentially Protestant structure is shaped in the style of the Catholic art of the Middle Ages, and although open enough to criticism, is a not displeasing result of the revival of medieval architecture, which made its influence so widely felt about that time. Church restoration became the fashion among the Anglican clergy to such an extent that Emerson, in his bantering way, pronounces the only Gospel they preached to be "By taste are ye saved."* Of course, from a religious point of view, there was much unreality in this revival. The men who were most anxious to remove from their churches every trace of three centuries of Protestantism, were often themselves as far removed from the most rudimentary ideas of Catholicism as the most tasteless of their Jacobean or Georgian predecessors. Still, doubtless, the revived medievalism had some effect in promoting the study of the history and institutions of the medieval period, although it is difficult to judge how much.

Far more directly traceable is the influence exercised by the Oxford movement over the studies and researches of English scholars. Our only writer of much account on the medieval period, in the preceding years of the present century, is Mr. Hallam; and, without at all undervaluing the merits which his "View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages" undoubtedly possesses, we must, at the present day, pronounce it to be extremely defective. Mr. Hallam had many of the qualities which go to make up a good historian; but he wrote nearly sixty years ago, with scanty materials and after slender studies,† and his philosophy did not dream of

* "English Traits," Works, vol. ii., p. 99 (Bohn's edition). Mgr. de Ségur, in his "Causeries sur le Protestantisme d'aujourd'hui," has a somewhat similar reflection: "Dans la théologie protestante," he remarks, "pour être sauvée, une mise décente est de rigueur."

† He tells us himself, with his usual candour, that he "hardly pretends to any direct acquaintance" with the works in which are the original sources of medieval history.—"Middle Ages," iii. p. 290, n. q. His chief modern authority for the contest between the Papacy and the Empire is Schmidt's "Hist. des Allemands."—Ibid. vol. ii. p. 236, n. k. Of the great philosophical and theological writers whose influence over medieval thought was so vast, he knew next to nothing; he expresses his surprise at having, "within a short time met with four living English writers who had read parts of

more things in heaven and earth than could be tried by the standard of modern Whiggism. The scholars who came under the influence of the Oxford movement saw those ages with other eyes, and judged of them by a very different measure. A striking indication of this change is supplied by Mr. Church's very beautiful and thoughtful essays on S. Anselm, originally published in the "*British Critic*."* Two other most accomplished and earnest minds may be mentioned among those who devoted themselves to the study of the period to which Oxford owes all that is still most venerable and winning in it. How powerfully Hurrell Froude was drawn to the medieval Church we have been told by the friend who knew him best;† while to John William Bowden we owe the best and completest account we possess in English of the most heroic figure in the illustrious catalogue of medieval Pontiffs. It was at about the same time that Dr. Maitland published his well-known volume on the Dark Ages, which, perhaps, did more than anything else to clear away the mass of ignorant bigotry which had grown round the prevailing tradition. Few who have read—as who has not?—that most interesting and amusing book will be likely to forget either his scathing exposure of Mosheim's garbled quotation from S. Eloy, or his well-merited castigation of the ignorant and presumptuous charlatan then—and possibly still—popular as an historian of the Protestant Reformation. Another work, referable to the same period, which exercised considerable influence at the time, is Mr. Kenelm Digby's "*Mores Catholici*," a noble and poetical production, judged by Montalembert to be "*le livre le plus propre à faire connaître et aimer le moyen âge*." There can be no doubt that the awakened interest in the Middle Ages which these and similar publications evidenced and kindled has had much to do with the greater attention since paid in England—and especially at Oxford—to modern history. But, so far as our literature is concerned, it can hardly be said that the succeeding four decades have fulfilled the expectations regarding the medieval period which the Tractarian movement might reasonably have raised. Of those whom it carried into the Catholic Church, one or two have indeed done just enough in this

Thomas Aquinas," but cannot bring himself to think that there are four more in this country who can say the same.—*Ibid.* iii. p. 428, n. i. It is observable that, in a note dated 1848, he confesses his fear that he has "fallen a little too much into the fashion of exaggerating the crimes and follies of the Middle Ages,"—a fashion which, he justly adds, "prevailed in the eighteenth century."—*Ibid.* iii. p. 301, n. o.

* Republished by Messrs. Mozley in 1854, with other essays and reviews of Mr. Church's.

† "*Apologia*," p. 24.

department to excite vivid regrets that they have not done much more. We owe to F. Newman some inimitable sketches of the schools and cloisters of the Middle Ages;* and the late F. Dalgairns has left us an admirable essay on the spiritual life of medieval England†—almost his only contribution to a subject which he was peculiarly qualified to handle. Nor has English Protestantism been very prolific in this branch of literature. There is, indeed, the late Dean Milman's "History of Latin Christianity," every page of which may truly be said to bear the impress of his high gifts; but unfortunately the point of view from which he regarded his subject rendered any satisfactory treatment of it impossible. We may, perhaps, best characterize that point of view as the mildly rationalistic. He has indeed somewhere described himself as surveying Christianity in a "temporal, social, and political light"; and herein is the secret why his work, scholarly, eloquent—nay, with reservations, we may say,—candid as it is, possesses but little practical value. He has written of Latin Christianity with an insufficient appreciation of the fact that Christianity is a religion. Perhaps the most instructed and sympathetic Anglican ecclesiastical writer on the medieval period is the late Dr. Neale. But his sins in the way of *suppressio veri* are certainly very heavy. Mr. Hemans' book on "Medieval Christianity and Sacred Art in Italy" contains much information, not always strictly accurate; but is written in a dull, leaden style, which renders its perusal a matter of difficulty. Mrs. Jameson's well-known and justly popular volumes have done much to promote among us a reverential and intelligent study of the great Christian schools of painting, and the carefully-executed publications of the Arundel Society have, as a rule, merited very high praise.

Of our recent writers on medieval history, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Haddan, and Mr. Freeman are perhaps the most noticeable; and we are far from underrating the merits of these distinguished scholars, or from being ungrateful for the information they have given us. But in each of them we trace, to a greater or less extent, the influence of prepossessions which, in our judgment, seriously impair the value of their works. This is particularly the case with Mr. Bryce and Mr. Freeman. Mr. Bryce's book on the Holy Roman Empire was fortunate in the opportunity of its publication, and has undoubtedly been of great service in popular-

* See especially his "Rise and Progress of Universities," and his "Benedictine Schools," in vols. ii. and iii. of his "Historical Sketches."

† Prefixed to Philp's edition of the "Scale of Perfection," London, 1876.

izing juster views of his subject than were common when he wrote. But it is impossible to be blind to its serious blemishes. Mr. Kenelm Digby has animadverted, not unjustly, on the proneness of modern historians* "to regard their own judgment as an infallible tribunal:" "they never have any doubt," he continues, "about the secret motives and causes of actions and events. . . . They pass through the walks of history, rashly judging from their own preconceived fancies, rather than from any calm and cautious scrutiny of things, and then pronounce their own sentence." Certainly Mr. Bryce's book is to a certain extent obnoxious to these censures. It was originally published as a prize essay, and prize essays, whatever be their advantages, are not favourable to the cultivation of a spirit of diffidence and modesty. Mr. Bryce's great fault is that in the place of the objective facts of history, he too often presents us with his merely subjective ideas. Thus, in writing of the progress of that "grand historical drama" which issued in the coronation of Charlemagne and the renovation of the Roman empire, while owning that the Frankish monarch and the Roman Pontiff "might well seem to be guided by the purest zeal for the spiritual welfare of the world," that "their character and bearing in the sight of expectant Christendom were worthy of men destined to leave an indelible impress on their own and many succeeding ages," he adds an assurance that, in fact, both king and pontiff "were influenced by meaner motives"; Charles "by the stirrings of personal ambition, and Adrian I. by the desire of territorial aggrandisement," by "that love of worldly wealth and power which, mingled with the dawning prospect of an independent principality, now began to seduce the Popes into a long course of guilt and intrigue."† And this hypothesis—for it is a mere nude hypothesis—is preferred by Mr. Bryce to the conclusion fairly and naturally deducible from the facts of the case. Mr. Emerson has observed with much truth, that "distrust in human virtue" is a "scar of the scepticism of this age."‡ Again, Mr. Bryce's book is coloured by what we must take leave to call an unhistoric theory as to the nature of the Imperial authority. He holds that the original conception of the revived empire was that of a second earthly viceroyalty of God,§ ruling "the world—monarchy" by a direct divine right—the sister, though the younger sister of the Papacy; and he quotes, in support of this view, the

* "Mores Catholici," book vi. c. i.

† Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire," 2nd ed., p. 46.

‡ "Conduct of Life." Works, vol. ii. p. 397. Bohn's edition.

§ "Holy Roman Empire," pp. 113 and 118.

Sachsenspiegel. A compilation of Imperialist lawyers of the time of Frederick II. is hardly a trustworthy authority for the original idea of the revived empire. And undoubtedly this theory, which we fully agree with Mr. Bryce in regarding as "impracticable," although we can hardly concede that it is also "sublime,"* is of late origin, probably of the time of Frederick Barbarossa, and opposed to historical fact. Leo III., who may reasonably be supposed to have known what he did on that memorable Christmas-day, expressly claims the renewed empire as his own creation. In a document which still remains to us he says, speaking of Charlemagne, "Quem, auctore Deo, in defensionem et provectum universalis S. Ecclesiæ Augustum hodie sacravimus."† And, until the Reformation broke up Christendom, it was ever recognized that only coronation at the hand of the Pope bestowed the Imperial crown. The full power of the empire and the dignity of Cæsar were held, not indeed feudally, but, if we may so speak, ecclesiastically, of the Sovereign Pontiffs, who, before conferring them, claimed the right of examining the fitness of the royal postulant; otherwise, as Innocent III. puts it, "the Pope might be forced to anoint and crown, as protector of Christendom, any tyrant, madman, heathen, or heretic." In fact, the distinction between the "imperium" and the "regnum Teutonicum," with which no one is better acquainted than Mr. Bryce, is too often obscured by his imperialist proclivities.‡

Mr. Freeman, we regret to say, sins more heavily still in the same direction. The learning, breadth of view, and

* Boniface VIII. more aptly, in the bull "Unam Sanctam," calls it "monstrous": "Ecclesiæ unius et unicæ unum corpus, unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum."

† Diploma of 25th Dec., 800, quoted in Hergenröther's "Catholic Church and Christian State," vol. ii. p. 3. The whole question of the relations between the Pope and the Holy Roman Empire is admirably treated in Hergenröther's 9th Essay.

‡ Mr. Bryce, in a note, p. 117, observes, that his "theory as to the complete accord of the papal and imperial powers was attained, perhaps, at only three points in their history: in the time of Charles and Leo; again under Otto III. and his two Popes, Gregory V. and Sylvester III.; thirdly, under Henry III." It is possible that Charlemagne, in his indomitable energy and in the consciousness of his high aims, may occasionally have gone beyond his proper sphere as the delegate for secular affairs of the Vicar of Christ; but we think Mr. Bryce misconceives the general spirit of his ecclesiastical policy as Emperor (the synod of Frankfort, it will be remembered, was held six years before his coronation); and nothing can be unfairer than to infer the normal relations of the Pope and the Emperor from the wholly exceptional measures which the degradation of the Papacy in the tenth and the first half of the eleventh century appears to have forced on the Church's "advocates."

power of treatment of which his paper on "Ancient Greece and Medieval Italy," published twenty years ago in "Oxford Essays," gave such ample promise, have been signally displayed in his later writings. He is undoubtedly entitled to a very high place among English historians; but his great gifts are infected by his bitter prepossessions against the Holy See, and by what we must take leave to call his fanatic nationalism. The lurking consciousness of the falsity of their position is ever a stumbling-block to English Protestants of the Anglican type, when they betake themselves to the writing of modern history. It is almost certain to interfere with the exercise of that calm, judicial temper, so necessary to the historian, which is the signal merit of many great German Protestant labourers in the same field—such as Ranke and Neander—whose position, however unsatisfactory to the Catholic mind, is, at all events, logically defensible. Bishop Butler has admirably remarked that "it is as easy to shut the eyes of the mind as those of the body."* We may add that no habit is sooner formed than this of intellectual self-obscurantism, and that when once formed it rapidly becomes inveterate. Mr. Freeman's most recently published book† supplies curious and painful evidence of the extent to which this habit has fastened upon him. Thus he cannot admire the stately church at Vercelli without casting a gibe, through its founder, the legate Walo, at the Apostolic throne (p. 299). "As became a papal emissary," we are told, Walo "appears also as a merciless plunderer of the clergy and nation of England." Again, writing of the late Bishop of Trèves, he mocks the bonds of that venerable prisoner of Jesus Christ as imaginary suffering;‡ and to come to a still grosser instance, after taking the unfortunate Mr. Hare severely to task for "sneering at what he thinks it decent to call the Sardinian Government,"—he proceeds to describe Pius IX. as "sulking in the Vatican palace, and refusing to be bishop because he cannot be king."§ The deliberate|| employment of language

* Sermon X.

† "Historical and Architectural Sketches, chiefly Italian." By E. D. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D. Macmillan. 1876.

‡ "A modern Bishop has suffered, or deems himself to have suffered," &c. (p. 62).

§ "The Bishops of Rome have forsaken their ancient Church and home, and he who visits the ancient choir of S. John Lateran may there see the patriarchal chair of Western Christendom cast forth as a useless thing, while he who should fill it sulks in a distant palace, refusing to be bishop because he can no longer be king" (p. 197).

|| We advisedly use the word "deliberately." The papers in Mr. Freeman's last volume were originally contributed to certain newspapers. It may be

of this kind is not merely an offence against good taste : in an historian it is something far more serious. A writer who can so obstinately dwell in "his own private darkness," with regard to current events, as to ignore the patent fact that Pius IX. is before all things and most emphatically Bishop, or to hint a doubt as to the reality of the sufferings of a Catholic Bishop in a Prussian jail, does not inspire confidence in the justness of his judgment of the persons and events of remote centuries, where his aberrations are more difficult to detect. It is, we own, with a certain feeling of relief that we turn away from the writings of our contemporary historians of the middle age, to publications such as those issued by the authority of the Master of Rolls, and by the Early English Text Society. Here we have the sources of history,—documents through which the men of those ages themselves tell us what they thought and did. It is well remarked by Mr. Peacock, in his preface to one of the most interesting volumes of the series, "*Myre's Instructions for Parish Priests*," that "a relic of this sort fished up from the forgotten past, is very useful to us as a help towards understanding the sort of lives our fathers lived. To many," he continues, with perhaps the smallest touch of subacidity, "it will seem strange that these directions, written without the least thought of hostile criticism, when there was no danger in plain speaking, and no inducements to hide or soften down, should be so free from superstition. We have scarcely any of the nonsense which some people still think made up the greater part of the religion of the middle age, but instead thereof good sound morality, such as it would be pleasant to hear preached at the present day."* Certainly, in history, as in law, the maxim holds good, "*Melius est petere fontes quam sectari rivulos.*"

So much must suffice with regard to that cultivation of the study of modern history among us which had its origin in the Oxford movement. It would, however, be a great error to regard that movement as something merely British and insular. It was, in fact, the manifestation in this country of that great religious and intellectual revival which made itself felt throughout Europe after the

urged on behalf of journalists, that they exist to minister to popular passions, and that their expressions, therefore, should not be weighed too nicely. But when newspaper articles are collected and republished, they may fairly be taken as conveying the deliberate judgment of the writer.

* "*Instructions for Parish Priests*," by John Myre, edited from Cotton MS., Claudius A. II., by Edward Peacock, F.S.A. London : Published for the Early English Text Society. Trübner, 1868. Preface, p. vii.

fiery storm of the French Revolution had shattered and consumed the outworn world of Renaissance ideas. Men's minds turned in loathing from the hollow sentimentalism and conventional unrealities of the last century to the full, vigorous life of the earlier age, which had so long lain under proscription as dark and barbarous. The literary effects of this newly-awakened interest in the medieval period have been far more considerable, indeed, on the Continent than in England. In Italy an illustrious band of scholars, headed by Balbo and Troja, have devoted themselves to the elucidation of the true character of the epoch to which their country owes all that is greatest in her history and noblest in her art: an epoch which requires a far different treatment from that which it has received at the hands of Sismondi, whose account of the Italian Republics is still the standard authority among us. A recent writer in the "*Quarterly Review*" has observed, not without pathos, "It is hard to believe that during those five centuries in which Italy attained an almost unexampled splendour in culture, in literature, in science, and in the arts, her people were engaged in no other occupation than that of butchering each other, and that the country was overrun by bands of 'condottieri' and plunderers, who carried ruin and desolation wherever they went. And yet such is the popular notion of the state of Italy during that period, in spite of the evidence which every city and town offers to the contrary."* He further remarks that "the true history of Italy during that period" is "not the chronicle of the intrigues of ambitious and unscrupulous families, but the history of her economical condition, of her trade, her industries, and the social"—and (we beg leave to interpolate) religious—state of her people. Much help towards the solution of the problem which perplexes the *Quarterly Reviewer* may be found in the pages of Cæsare Cantu and Tosti, of Cibrario and Capecehatro, not to speak of the vast mass of original documents and local histories which have of late years been given to the world by Italian scholars.

To France, too, we are indebted, during the last half-century, for many valuable studies in medieval history. The works of Montalembert and Rio are in every one's hands, and it is not easy to overrate the wholesome influence they have exercised. The one by his brilliant eloquence and contagious enthusiasm has done more than any one else to awaken the interest of his countrymen in the Ages of Faith; and, indeed, it is not too much to say that even now his masterly introduc-

* Vol. 132, p. 122.

tion to the Life of St. Elizabeth, although the colouring is undoubtedly too bright, remains, on the whole, the best general sketch of their most striking features. The work of the other on Christian Art was little less than a revelation to a large class of readers, of the aims and meaning of the great religious painters of Christendom. Guizot again, although a Protestant and—we use the word in its least offensive sense—a doctrinaire, has done much for the diffusion of juster conceptions of medieval history. Guérard and Delisle, the two Thierries, Ozanam and Ampère, are savants of European celebrity. Of M. Michelet, Mr. Mill has, with much truth, remarked * that “he is the subjective historian of the Middle Ages, making us comprehend, better than any one else, what was really passing in the collective minds of each generation.” M. Locoy has written a learned book on the thirteenth century. M. Ménard’s treatise, “L’Art au Moyen Age,” is full of valuable matter. M. Pouchet’s “L’Albert le Grand et son Epoque,” although we cannot always follow the author, is on the whole worthy of the reputation it has obtained. M. Huillard Bréholle’s “Historia Diplomatica Frederici Secundi” and his “Vie et Correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne” have received high and deserved commendation from Mr. Freeman, and have furnished him with a subject for one of his most interesting essays.† M. Havard’s “Le Moyen Age et ses Institutions” is a meritorious specimen of a popular historical work, and deserves to be better known in this country than it is; and the “Documents Inédits,” ‡ published by official authority, and corresponding to the series issued in this country under the order of the Master of the Rolls, are of the highest historic value.

We have mentioned these books merely as specimens, and almost at hazard. To give a complete catalogue of the valuable works illustrative of the Middle Ages which have been published of late years in France, would be a task alike beyond our limits and our knowledge. And the same may be said with far greater reason regarding Germany. From the beginning of the century Teutonic scholars have laboured

* “Discussions and Dissertations,” vol. ii. p. 141.

† “Historical Essays,” No. X.

‡ It is not so generally known as it ought to be that we are indebted to M. Guizot for the publication of these “Documents.” “Cette entreprise,” remarks M. Biot, “fut proposée par lui au roi, dans un rapport spécial, en date du 31 décembre 1833; et les fonds nécessaires pour en commencer l’exécution, furent accordés par les chambres législatives sur le budget de 1835. Cet immense travail fut organisé sans retard par le même ministre, et il a été continué depuis par tous ses successeurs avec une persévérance qui les honore.”—“Mélanges Scientifiques et Littéraires,” vol. iii. p. 168, note.

with their wonted conscientiousness and industry in this department, and the result is the creation of a most extensive and valuable literature. Catholics and Protestants have alike toiled in this field, and on both sides unscrupulous partisanship has occasionally been displayed; but it is curious and significant, that as the greatest of modern religious painters—Overbeck—approached the Church through medieval art, so a number of distinguished scholars—conspicuous among whom are Hurter and Phillips—have been brought into her fold by their studies in medieval history. Of more recent writers we will mention only two. Hergenröther, whose valuable work on the “Catholic Church and Christian State” recently made accessible to English readers, gives the best and clearest account with which we are acquainted, of the relations existing in the Middle Ages between the Papacy and the civil power; and Potthast, the title of whose admirable compilation we have prefixed to this article. The “*Bibliotheca Historica Medii Ævi*,” is a work which will henceforth be almost indispensable to the student who wishes to investigate medieval history in a scientific spirit. It is a bibliographical dictionary, singularly accurate and complete, from the year 300 A.D. to the year 1500 A.D., with brief critical notices of the principal writers, and must certainly have cost the learned author the best years of a laborious life. Apparently only German industry, simplicity, and patience are capable of the self-devotion required thus to labour in the foundations. How meritorious would it be if half the writers among us, who misspend their lives in the production of vapid fictions or shallow theologies, which have not even the poor *raison d’être* of selling, would betake themselves to labour in this field, where there is work even for the meanest capacity. Would it not be possible, in an age which prides itself on its industrial mechanism, to establish a society of index-makers? Could not the Lords of the Council be persuaded to subsidize such an institution, with even one hundredth part of the sum which they lavish on “schools of art,” as though any true art could be hatched by official machinery, at whatever cost provided? Certainly, until something of the kind is accomplished, the treasures of medieval manuscripts, buried in public libraries, must remain almost inaccessible; for the mere private efforts of individual scholars are quite unequal to their satisfactory investigation.

Such then is in outline—how superficial and imperfect the outline is we are only too well aware—what has been done during the last century to break down the old evil tradition, which had so long obscured the medieval period. And, no

doubt, the general result is considerable. Materials are now available by which the scholar who knows how to use them may get a tolerably clear conception of what human life in the different ages and regions of medieval Europe really was. What judgment he will form upon the facts of the existence of which he satisfies himself, of course depends, in great measure, upon the standard by which he judges. It is absurd to suppose that any historian can write without more or less strong prepossessions. But it is one thing to have prepossessions, and to be on one's guard against them: it is another to give oneself up blindly to their sway. A man's judgment of any matter is necessarily influenced by his first principles. The Catholic and the Rationalist set out with entirely different first principles, and hence the results at which they arrive in the philosophy of history, as in other departments of intellectual speculation, must ever be very far apart. The Catholic can hardly fail to arise from the study of the Middle Ages with the conviction that, in spite of the ferocity and disorder, the dearth of physical comfort and the absence of intellectual luxuries, which mark well-nigh every page of their history, Europe was throughout them eminent,—though in ever-varying degrees—"in the best characteristics of man and of society"—in happiness, nobility, wisdom, which, according to Mr. J. S. Mill, are the constituents of civilization in the higher sense;* and this, because he conceives of happiness, nobility, and wisdom, as depending upon "an inward condition of the mind and spirit," the existence of which in that period is shown by ample evidence. On the other hand, the Rationalist, whose notion of perfection† is wholly, or in great part, material, while recognizing the great characters and heroic actions which adorn that period, will arrive at general conclusions very unfavourable to it, on the ground that it was full of cruelty and superstition,—and rude in physical science and mechanical appliances. But, however widely divergent the inferences which are drawn, there will now be, to a great extent, a consensus as to facts. For example, the view of S. Gregory VII., formerly so general, as a mere grasping and selfish hierarch, careless of the rights of conscience and intent only on the gratification of vulgar pride and low ambition; or the conception, once widely prevalent, of S. Francis, as half-

* "Discussions and Dissertations," vol. i. p. 160.

† "The idea of perfection," writes Mr. Arnold, "as an inward condition of the mind and spirit, is at variance with the mechanical and material civilization, so much in esteem with us."—"Culture and Anarchy," p. 17.

idiot, half-impostor; or the notion expressed in the familiar line in Pope's "Essay on Criticism,"

"And the Monks finished, what the Goths begun,"

would not now be put forward by any writer of repute. These and many other articles of the old tradition linger in the ignorance of the popular mind, and are still solemnly paraded from time to time by an influential section of the journalism of the day, which trades upon that ignorance. But in higher intellectual circles they have been discarded.

Still, much as has been done for all the epochs of the medieval period to purge away the darkness of the Renaissance tradition, and to let in the light of science, the history of the Middle Ages remains to be written, and we hardly think the time is as yet ripe for writing it. To estimate correctly the condition of the human race in any age is no easy task, and, as Mr. Mill has remarked,* the first requisite for success in it is a due sense of its difficulty. The difficulty is especially redoubtable in dealing with the medieval period,—a period so diversified, so obscure in parts, so full of ruthless violence in its best ages, so stern and rigid in its noblest aspects, so near to us chronologically, so remote from us politically and socially, that the highest gifts may well shrink from the attempt to portray and estimate it. The description given by Tacitus of the task to which he set himself in the *Histories*,†—"Opus opimum casibus, atrox præliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace severum," applies far more strongly to this undertaking, and a Tacitus is not often given to the world. It may as truly be said of the historian as of the poet, "*Nascitur non fit.*" Indeed, no man can be a great historian without possessing much of the "vision and the faculty divine."‡ Wide

* "All students of man and society who possess that first requisite for so difficult a study, a due sense of its difficulty, are aware," &c.—"*Discussions and Dissertations*," vol. i. p. 399.

† "*Hist.*," l. i. c. 2.

‡ Wordsworth, in his preface to the edition of 1815, enumerates six powers requisite for the production of poetry, all of which we may pronounce unhesitatingly to be necessary to the historian. They are as follows: First, those of Observation and Description,—i.e. the ability to observe with accuracy things as they are in themselves, and with fidelity to describe them, unmodified by any passion or feeling existing in the mind of the describer. . . . Secondly, Sensibility,—which, the more exquisite it is, the wider will be the range of a poet's perceptions, and the more will he be incited to observe objects, both as they exist in themselves and as re-acted upon by his own mind. . . . Thirdly, Reflection,—which makes the Poet acquainted with the value of actions, images, thoughts, and feelings; and assists the sensibility in perceiving their connection with each other. Fourthly, Imagination and Fancy,—to modify, to create, and to associate.

learning, sincere and unswerving loyalty to truth, a judicial mind, a power of lucid statement, and that rarer faculty which we may call the gift of historical diagnosis, are not enough ;—

“ but, as the stuff
Prepared for Arras pictures is not picture
Till it be formed, and man hath cast the beams
Of his imaginous fancy thorough it,”

so all these high endowments require to be vivified by poetic, that is creative genius, if the “ forms of things unknown ” are to be bodied forth, and the past is to live before us.

That a Catholic writer equal to this great work will be given to us in due season we will hope and believe. History is a department of human knowledge, which has ever been dear to Catholics. To a Catholic Saint and Doctor, as Mr. Allies has pointed out,* the very idea of a philosophy of history is due; the historical writers of medieval times were, almost without exception, ecclesiastics; to Catholics the world owes those massive antiquarian works,—such as the great collection of Muratori,—which were the chief contributions of the Renaissance period to historical research.† Of the historical labours of Catholic authors of the present century we have already spoken in such brief fashion as is possible to us here. Of all the shameless calumnies with which in these latter days the Church has been assailed, one of the most impudently mendacious is the imputation of an aversion to history. It is no mere *tu quoque* rejoinder of controversy, but a simple statement of fact, that this reproach most justly attaches to the very school by which it is commonly levelled at her. “The disrespect,” remarks Mr. Mill, “in which history was held by the French philosophers is notorious. One of the soberest of them—D’Alembert, we believe, was the author of the wish that all record of past events could be blotted out.”‡ The *Libres Penseurs* of the present day, on

Fifthly, Invention,—by which characters are composed out of materials supplied by observation. . . . And, lastly, Judgment,—to decide how and where, and in what degree each of these faculties ought to be exerted ; so that the less shall not be sacrificed to the greater ; nor the greater, slighting the less, arrogate to its own injury more than its due.—Works, Cent. edition, vol. vi. p. 386.

* “Formation of Christendom,” part i. p. 27.

† We regard the Renaissance period as extending from the Protestant Reformation to the French Revolution, but it would perhaps be more correct to fix the beginning of that period and the close of the Middle Ages at the year 1453, the date of the fall of Constantinople. In such matters, however, exact chronology is not attainable.

‡ “Dissertations and Discussions,” vol. i. p. 426.

whom the mantle of the "Philosophes" has fallen, no longer adopt their method of ignoring the past; it receives from their hands a worse treatment. Despising it no less heartily than their predecessors, they view it through a medium of passion and prejudice, which fatally obscures it, and write of it not in the spirit of scientific students, but of political pamphleteers.

Far different should be the temper in which the Catholic approaches history. To him, whether it records the triumphs of truth and justice, or their momentary defeat; whether it exhibits the especial witnesses for God in the world as faithfully fulfilling their divine mission, or as prostituting their powers and gifts to the vilest uses, it is a sacred record of the dealings of the Most High with the human race;—"holy ground," to be trodden reverentially with the bare feet of detachment from personal and party ends. His concern is with the dead, who have long passed the dread tribunal before which he too must one day appear, and who have a peculiarly solemn claim upon us to judge of them, after our measure, by the standard of truth. It is not for him to explain away the virtues which evil men have shown, or to ignore the crimes or errors of the good and great. Nay, even in the Saints he will not dissemble their "lingering imperfections"; he

"hath learned this book of man
Full of the notes of frailty."

But he has learned too that

"In the unreasoning progress of the world
A wiser spirit is at work for us
A better eye than ours."

And he knows—there are emphatic examples enough in ecclesiastical annals to teach it—that to distort* history in the name of religion, in order to serve the miserable intrigues or the petty interests of the hour, is, in fact, to strike at Religion herself, who has ever received her most grievous wounds in the house of her friends. Nothing is more injurious to the cause which they have at heart than the intemperate and unscrupulous advocacy which some well-meaning but unwise Catholics practise in dealing with the records of the past; nothing more inconsistent with the true functions of an

* There is a pregnant remark of Coleridge in his "Aids to Reflection" (25th Aphorism). "He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth will proceed by loving his own sect better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all."

historian than the employment of invective and vituperation. The historian is not an advocate, but a judge, and

"He only judges right who weighs, compares,
And in the sternest sentence which his voice
Pronounces, e'er remembers charity."

Such, as it seems to us, is the tone of mind in which the investigation of medieval history should be approached. We proceed to offer a few remarks upon one or two considerations which should ever be kept in view in order to its fruitful study. And, first, we may observe that the great rock upon which most students strike is generalization. The vulgar error is to regard the Middle Ages as an unbroken entity presenting the same social and political characteristics throughout. But it is equally a mistake to allow the constant changes, of almost every kind, in the condition of Europe, traceable from the beginning of the ninth to the end of the fifteenth century,—which we take to be the true limits of the medieval period,—to obscure the fact that from one, and that a most important, point of view, those centuries may properly be regarded as a whole. Between these two opposite and fundamental errors there exists the ground for almost every variety of misconception, and it is hardly too much to say that every variety of misconception may be met with. There are, indeed, few writers of the present day, possessing any pretensions to scholarship, who are blind to the constant mutations in the public order, the diverse and conflicting currents of thought, the steady widening of the field of private enterprise and personal action, during those seven hundred years. But there are many who pin their faith to one or two authors, and who look through their spectacles at their contemporaries, or at the whole medieval period; many more who mistake local for general customs, and draw universal conclusions from wholly inadequate premises. Thus, to take an example from a recent writer, who has won much popularity, Mr. Green, in his "*History of the English People*," speaks as follows of Walter de Map: "Picture after picture strips the veil from the corruption of the medieval Church, its indolence, its thirst for gain, its secret immorality."* Now, putting aside for the present the question as to the value of the testimony of a writer like Walter de Map, regarding the ecclesiastical abuses of his time, it is quite certain that his evidence, even if accepted without reserve, is utterly inadequate to the sweeping condemnation of "the medieval Church" which Mr. Green

* "*Short History of the English People*," p. 115.

founds upon it. Or, to ascend to a higher authority, Mr. Furnivall in a note to Dr. Brentano's admirable essay on the history and development of Gilds,* talks of "the days of Chaucer and Wyckliffe, of William who had the vision of Piers the Plowman, and others, who have left us records of what Romanism, with its monks and friars, practically then was in England." Remarking, in passing, on the animus which is apparent from the designation of fourteenth century Catholicism as "Romanism," it may be objected, we venture to think, with the plainest justice, that the testimony of a theological writer notoriously disaffected to the Church, and of two satirical poets, however great their literary excellence, hardly merits to be so unhesitatingly adopted, in the face of the vast amount of evidence on the other side, furnished by the English authors of the age, with whom few scholars have a more intimate acquaintance than Mr. Furnivall. The charges of the religious innovator surely ought to be received with the greatest caution, and as regards Piers Plowman and Chaucer we shall do well to remember Gray's very sensible remark, that it was "the custom of these times," that "satire and irony should fall either upon the women or upon the clergy,"† and that, in point of fact, the former of these classes is, at the least, as severely dealt with by medieval poets and story-tellers as the latter. No one, however, would think, we imagine—we are sure Mr. Furnivall would not think—of drawing hence a general conclusion as to the unchastity of the female sex at the epoch in question. Why should different measure be dealt to the ecclesiastical order? Mr. Hallam carries this species of generalization still further. In a long passage "on the vices of the monks and clergy," which aptly ends with the garbled passage from S. Eloy—long the stock quotation on the subject—he remarks, "I know not by what right we should disbelieve the documents of the visitation under Henry VIII.;" and from these reports, together with "the

* "The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred English Gilds, &c.," edited by the late Toulmin Smith, Esq., &c., with a preliminary essay, in five parts, by Lujo Brentano, Doctor Juris utriusque et Philosophie. Published for the Early English Text Society, by N. Trübner & Co., London. Int., p. lxxxvi.

† Works (Pickering's edition) vol. v. p. 310. Gray gives the following account of "the causes which directed the satire of our old writers to these two objects." "As the religious were the principal scholars of their age, they probably gave the tone in writing or in wit to the rest of the nation. The celibacy imposed upon them by the Church had soured their temper, and naturally disposed them (as is observed of old bachelors in our day) to make the weaknesses of the other sex their theme; and though every one had a profound respect for his own particular order, yet the feuds and bickerings between one order and another were perpetual and irreconcilable, &c."

solemn declaration of councils, the reports of judicial inquiry, the casual evidence of common fame in the ballad and romance," and "the farrago of evidence in Fosbrooke's 'British Monachism,'" * he draws a conclusion as to the "general corruption of monastic institutions" in the Middle Ages. Apart from the evidence, not so accessible to Mr. Hallam as it is to us, as to the character of Henry VIII.'s "visitors," the fable of the wolf and the lamb might have suggested a reason for hesitation as to the value of their reports. That scandals did exist in religious houses, from time to time, during the Middle Ages, no candid person would seek to deny. There is conclusive evidence of the fact in the public documents referred to by Mr. Hallam, and elsewhere. But to draw from such occasional derelictions from their high standard, and from the testimony of officials expressly hired to work their destruction by Henry VIII., the inference of the "corruption" of those institutions throughout the Middle Ages is most unwarrantable. The error of generalizing from particular customs is as common as that of generalizing from particular authorities, and forcibly illustrates Mr. Mill's sagacious remark, that the "besetting danger" of the "student of man and society" is "not so much of embracing falsehood for truth, as of mistaking part of the truth for the whole." † It would be easy to adduce examples of this fault; but, perhaps, it is not worth while so to encumber our pages. The reader may find them in sufficient abundance in a voluminous history of France recently given to the world by an author who has "obtained great pensions and great praise," M. Henri Martin, and he will be greatly aided in his search by a temperate and well-written little volume of "*Critiques et Réfutations*," by M. de l'Epinoz, in which many of M. Martin's errors are pointed out. M. de l'Epinoz aptly quotes ‡ the following weighty reflections of M. Biot:—"Quand les écrivains modernes mentionnent quelque usage local, quelque particularité isolée du moyen âge, c'est presque toujours pour en prendre occasion de les faire contraster, en bien ou en mal, avec ce qui a bien aujourd'hui. De pareils rapprochements sont en général faux dans leur principe et sans justesse dans leurs conséquences . . . Tachons," M. Biot adds, "que notre philosophie ait la patience de bien connaître ces faits avant de se mettre à les juger." We may add that "to be well acquainted with the facts" is no easy task. Feudal customs were exceedingly diversified, especially in France,

* "Middle Ages," vol. iii. p. 303.

† "Dissert. and Discus.," vol. i. p. 399.

‡ P. 111.

where, as Beaumanoir tells us, "on ne pourroit pas trouver deux chasteleries qui de toz cas uzassent d'une meisme costume."*

The student of medieval history will then require to be ever on his guard against rashly generalizing from particular authorities or customs. He will ever also keep in view the great fact that the period which we call the Middle Ages divides itself into many epochs, each possessing peculiar and distinguishing features, and each differing from the rest both in point of time and character, in the various regions of Europe. The scene which presents itself to us when we first try to take (in Mr. Hallam's phrase) "a view of Europe during the Middle Ages," is striking but illusory. Like the man in the Gospel whose eyes were opened, we see "men as trees walking." All is enveloped in mist, and is not without a certain misty grandeur; nor are our conceptions ever likely to be clearer and more real unless we rigidly apply to our investigations the rules of intellectual discipline. A good example of the notions of the medieval period which ardent but unscientific research is likely to produce, is supplied by Mr. Digby's *Mores Catholici*. As we fall under the spell of those fascinating volumes the centuries swim before our eyes; we are transported from one end of Europe to the other: time and space are annihilated for us by the author's "happy magic." It is delightful, but it is not history; as indeed it hardly professes to be. The laws of historical science are severe, and one of the most fundamental of them is a rigid attention to local and chronological limits. It is only when the student "learns the connection of part with part; separates what moves from what is stationary";† abstracts, analyzes, and defines, that the dimness of his mind's eye is removed; in the "mighty maze" he traces the plan, and "the kaleidoscope changes into a picture." Of course, some central point is necessary to him round which to group the objects which present themselves. That point may be differently chosen; but obviously the choice of it is a matter of much importance. It appears to us that the only way of obtaining a just view of European history during the medieval period is by regarding it in the light of its dominant idea. There is one great fact running through it to which it owes its entity as a period, and which is imprinted on all its epochs, authorities, and customs: that fact is, the prevalence of Catholic unity. Medieval history is beyond and before things the history of the growth, empire, and decline

* P. 107. † See F. Newman's "Idea of a University," p. 331 (last edition).

of the idea which is conventionally expressed by the word Christendom, and the perpetual recognition of this fact is essential to its philosophical study.* It would be most interesting to trace the progress of that idea, from the time when it was distinctly manifested to the world by Leo III. and Charlemagne, to the time when the great religious and political changes associated with the names of the Renaissance† and the Protestant Reformation proclaimed its downfall to a generation which little understood the tidings. We should find in the story the grandest illustration of the noble verses of our great poet:—

“The ample proposition that hope reaches
In all designs begun on earth below,
Fails in the promised largeness : checks and disasters
Grow in the veins of actions highest reared.”

Of the “promised largeness,” indeed, we should meet with some realization in the two centuries and a half from S. Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII., when the kingdom of Christ ruled over all, and His Vicars used their “two-edged sword” “ad faciendam vindictam in nationibus, increpationes in populis : ad alligandos reges eorum in compedibus et nobiles eorum in manicis ferreis” : the “fettters” of charity, the “manacles” of the divine law. The rest of the history is only too full of the “checks and disasters.” The chronicle of the two centuries from the death of Nicholas I. is little more than a tissue of catastrophes. The social order only emerged from the chaos‡ (to use M. Guizot’s expression) which had engulfed it after the death of Charlemagne to enter into the feudal system. Christian bishops were metamorphosed into military barons ; ecclesiastical unity seemed to be breaking up into local, partial, and individual distributions. “The period was distinguished for the greatest abuses of simony, for the completest arbitrary disposition of ecclesiastical benefices, and for the most deplorable corruption among the priests.”§ Even in the successor of Peter it is, at times, hard to recognize the Apostolic lineaments, and, under more than one Pontiff, the Lateran palace became infamous for scandals

* This is confessed by Mr. Hallam. “No one,” he writes, “can take a philosophical view of the Middle Ages without attending more than is at present fashionable to their ecclesiastical history.”—“Mid. Ages,” vol. iii. p. 299.

† Or, as Mr. Mill puts it, in words which bear another and a deeper sense for us than that which they had for him, “*that great breaking loose of the human faculties commonly called the revival of letters.*”—“Disser. and Discuss.,” vol. i. p. 57.

‡ “Lect. on Civilization,” vi.

§ Ibid.

parallel to those of the sons of Eli. But, throughout these evil times the idea of Christendom was silently growing, and we are cheered by the knowledge, as we toil on, that under S. Gregory VII. and his successors we shall see it in its maturity—a great tree, filling the earth, “its shadow covering the hills,” “and the boughs thereof like the cedars of God”; stretching out “its branches unto the sea, and its boughs unto the river.” No such reflection relieves the ever-thickening gloom of the last two centuries of the medieval period, “the most unprincipled centuries,” as F. Dalgairns* judges, “of the Christian era.” The steady dying-out from society of the supernatural principles on which so many generations had lived, and the constant advance of the pagan spirit of the modern world, make up the “sad epitome” of those times; and their course is faithfully imaged in the story of the Papacy. The Apostolic chair removed from its normal seat, and its occupant subjected to the influence of the French monarchy;† then its disputed possession, and the household of faith distracted by the claims of Antipopes—claims specious enough “to deceive the very elect”; and, lastly, its almost complete secularization; such are the three successive steps in the degradation of the Papacy, which mark only too accurately the stages in the decay of the idea of Christendom. Far more terrible is this age than that earlier period which Baronius‡ has so severely characterized; for then beneath rank exterior corruption and the similitude of death, the idea was germinating until the time appointed for its bursting forth into full life under the Hildebrandine reformation. Here is the reality of decay; and the issue is Luther and the destruction of the religious unity of Europe. It is, however, with that unity, as still existing, that we are now concerned; and the point immediately before us is the importance, in the study of the medieval period, of ever keeping it in view as the cardinal fact running throughout that period. We proceed to offer a few remarks in elucidation of this point.

The history of the world presents us with three distinct conceptions of the relation of religion to human society, con-

* “Holy Communion,” p. 225.

† Mr. Mill, expressing himself more warmly than we should think ourselves warranted in doing, writes, “In Clement V., for the first time, the Church sank into the abject tool of secular tyranny: with him commenced the new era of the Papacy, which made it the horror and disgust of the then rapidly improving European mind, until the Reformation and its consequences closed the period which we commonly call the Middle Age.”—

“Discus. and Dissert.,” vol. ii. p. 162.

‡ “Annales,” ad ann. 900.

ceptions which, for our present purpose, we may designate as the ancient, the medieval, and the modern. The chief characteristics of these conceptions are respectively nationality, universality, and individuality. In the political communities of antiquity religion played a very important part. It is notorious that this was the case in the Hebrew polity, where almost every detail of human existence, from the commonest natural functions up to the most important public transactions, was regulated by the Mosaic law. But it is not equally recognized that it was much the same among the "Gentiles, who knew not God," with, of course, this great difference,—that there the place and honour due to Him were usurped by demons. The conception of an atheistic state without recognized gods and sacred rites would have appeared monstrous to the ancients. The public profession of a religion was deemed essential to corporate existence; it was both the basis on which political communities rested and the tie which held them together. Thus Plato, in his Republic,* describes "the erection of temples and the appointment of sacrifices and other ceremonies in honour of the gods," and "all the observances we must adopt in order to propitiate the inhabitants of the other world," as "the most momentous, the most august, and the highest acts of legislation"; and very numerous passages to a similar effect might be quoted from other classical writers of Greece and Rome. It should be observed that this public profession of religion was strictly national, and again, that the ancient conception of a nation was purely tribal, the tribe being an enlarged family. No dream of any system of religion wider than race cults ever crossed the mind of the ancient world. "The heathen religions," writes Professor Jowett, "were the bonds of nations and of society, giving majesty to kings and authority to laws, linking men together in common acts of worship, arising out of an inward necessity for communion of gods and men, just as language is a necessity of the social state. As the religions, not of individuals, but of nations, . . . they could not but be political and local in their character."

Such was the conception of religion which obtained in the

* Book iv. c. v.—Τί οὖν εἶη ἐπὶ ἀν' ἡμῖν λοιπὸν τῆς νομοθεσίας εἶη; καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπον οὐδὲν. Ἡμῖν μὲν οὐδέν, τῷ μὲντοι Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖς τὰ τε μέγιστα καὶ κάλλιστα καὶ πρῶτα τῶν νομοθετημάτων. Τὰ ποῖα; ἢ δ' ὅς. Ἱερῶν τε ἰδρύσεις καὶ θυσίαι καὶ ἄλλαι θεῶν τε καὶ δαιμόνων καὶ ἡρώων θεραπείαι τελευτησάντων τε αὐθῆκαι καὶ ὅσα τοῖς ἐκεῖ δεῖ ὑπηρετοῦντας ἰλεως αὐτοὺς ἔχειν. τὰ γὰρ δὴ τοιαῦτα οὐτ' ἐπιστάμεθα ἡμῖς οἰκίζοντες τε πόλιν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ πεισόμεθα, ἐὰν νοὺν ἔχωμεν, οὐδὲ χρῆσόμεθα ἐξηγητῇ ἄλλ' ἢ τῷ πατρίφ. οὗτος γὰρ δῆπου ὁ θεὸς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις πάτριος ἐξηγητὴς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀμφαλοῦ καθήμενος ἐξηγεῖται. Καὶ καλῶς γ' εἶη λέγεις καὶ ποιητέον οὕτω.

ancient world. The conception of "modern thought" is its exact contrary. The dominant idea of our age with regard to religion is that it is purely a matter of individual concern. This is, indeed, the legitimate, nay, the necessary, outcome of what is called the principle of private judgment. We are well aware that those to whom we owe the introduction of this principle into the religious sphere by no means intended such a result. The design of the authors of the Protestant Reformation—which it is ever necessary to remember was at the least as much a political as a religious movement—incontestably was, to revert to the Pagan system of national religions. Such religions, it was justly considered, might serve as useful appendages to Cæsarism, and might play much the same part in the politics of the modern world as that which they played in the politics of antiquity. But ideas develop themselves according to laws of their own, and live on after their authors, working oftentimes the destruction of the institutions they were at first used to support. The neo-Christianity of the Reformation has been fatal to the churches which the reformers established. It has tended more and more to reduce religion from an objective fact to a subjective speculation, to make it a mere "private thing for each man's own conscience." And this view is adopted as a first principle by the philosophy of the age. "One man," it is said, "develops one set of ideas; another, another. One adopts a strict creed; another is free and bold. All religions . . . are matters of opinion, because they are matters of disposition and habit."* Nay more, religious isolation is put forward as a most sacred duty, according to the oft-quoted verse of Schiller:—

"Welche Religion ich bekenne ? Keine von allen
Die Du mir nennst. Und warum keine ? aus Religion."

Nothing could be more opposed than this to the ideas of the ancient world. And yet both the modern conception of the functions of religion and the ancient have in them elements of truth. They are true in the fundamental principles which they affirm; they are false in what they explicitly or implicitly deny. The ancient world was right in judging religion to be a matter of public concern; the modern world is equally right in holding it to be a matter for the individual conscience. The true religion embraces the whole man in all his relations. Christianity found the individual, the family, and the State, alike corrupt, and under the dominion of the powers of evil. It brought the principle of faith to

* J. H. Newman's "Sermons on Subjects of the Day," p. 84.

transform and re-create — a principle of universal application, as of universal necessity. Faith was to sanctify every relation and pursuit of human life; to spread "like a leaven through the thoughts, words, and works of men, until the whole was leavened."*

This was the conception of the mission of the Catholic Church entertained from the first, long before it became an imperial power. In the medieval period this conception was publicly adopted and avowed as the fundamental truth of human existence. The great and distinguishing peculiarity of those centuries is that in them, throughout Europe, the whole structure of man's life, public and private, was built upon religion. In the utter wreck of society which followed upon the dissolution of the Roman Empire, the several States constructed from its fragments, although originally Pagan or heretical, had eventually submitted to the Catholic Church, receiving from her the Divine Law as the rule of their institutions and the basis of their legislation; and she had crowned the edifice when her Supreme Pontiff chose the great monarch of the Franks as her "Advocate," investing him with the majesty of the Cæsars, and "anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." In the Middle Ages, then, the religion of Europe was individual: as the religion of "spirit and of truth" it could not but be so. It dealt primarily with each man's conscience: its call was personally addressed to each soul; but that call was a "calling into" a spiritual kingdom, in which each soul found its own "portion and inheritance." Then the medieval conception of religion was also national: all Christian men were *cives sanctorum*, subjects of the *Civitas Dei*, the world-wide kingdom of Him to whom had been given "the Gentiles for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession." And as in the ancient world, so in the medieval, the notion of citizenship was based upon the family. The *populus Dei* was a "*gens sancta*," into which men were admitted by the new birth of baptism: the members of this "*gens*" were *domestici Dei*, and the first of facts to them was their place in His family. Hence Christendom, not the particular region of it in which they happened to dwell, was their true country and the first object of their patriotism. The rigid lines of demarcation which in the ancient world had separated races, and had made the words stranger and enemy synonymous, were broken down. The phrase "Christian commonwealth" was a reality, and the several European States were merely sections of it.

* J. H. Newman's "Lectures on Justification," p. 273, 3rd edition.

In each, from every lip, went up the same common prayer to "Our Father": in each the same sacred rites created and sustained spiritual life, the same holy Latin tongue served as the medium for common sacrifice: over all ruled the same "faithful and wise servant" who from age to age sat in the Chair of Peter—the judge and guardian of the divine law, before which king and serf alike bowed in unquestioning reverence. For the first time in the world's history, as a learned writer has well observed, "Si non vide pur l' uomo, ma l' umanità: nè pur apparvero il cittadino e l' ilota, i greci ed i barbari, ma si vide una famiglia di fratelli con l'unico padre ch' è Dio."*

This, then, was the idea of Christendom, an idea which, as we have pointed out, in its several stages of existence and differing degrees of vitality, rules throughout the medieval period. It is an idea difficult for the student of the present day—even for the Catholic student—properly to appreciate; for, as Mr. Bryce has admirably remarked, "Here, as in so many other cases, the use of traditional language seems to have prevented us from seeing how great is the difference between our own times and those in which the phrases we repeat were first used, and used in full sincerity. Men do not, cannot, understand the intense fascination which the idea of one all-pervading Church exercised upon their medieval forefathers."† Still it is only in proportion as they succeed in understanding it that any true conception of the men and the events of those centuries is attainable. "A man's religion," remarks Mr. Carlyle, "is the chief fact about him. A man's, or a nation of men's, . . . The thing a man does practically believe, . . . lay to heart, and know for certain, concerning his vital relations to this mysterious universe, and his duty and destiny there, that is in all cases the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest. . . Of a man or a nation we inquire, therefore, first of all, what religion they had. . . Answering of this question is giving us the soul of the history of the man or nation. The thoughts they had were the parents of the actions they did; their feelings were the parents of their thoughts; it was the unseen and spiritual in them that determined the outward and actual; their religion, as I say, was the great fact about them."‡ We believe this to be universally true, but it is true in a peculiarly emphatic manner of the medieval period. The prevalence of religious unity in undoubting submission to the

* De Renzi, "Collectio Salernitana," t. i. p. 6.

† "Holy Roman Empire," p. 409.

‡ "Lectures on Heroes," Lect. I.

teaching of the Catholic Church is the chief note of the Middle Ages. Whatever men questioned, they did not question that; whatever they were at issue about, they were at one on that subject. That the Catholic religion was the complete revelation of the will of God, the supreme test of right and wrong, the absolute standard of life, whether public, family, or individual, was the cardinal truth, the fundamental axiom of human existence, which men then believed as simply as we now believe the multiplication table. This is the great fact about that period of the world's history, distinctly marking it off from all other periods. The practical consequences of this fact it is hardly possible to overrate. Let us attempt to trace in the faintest outline—it is all we can do here—a few of the more obvious of them, which, obvious as they are, are too frequently overlooked or misapprehended.

The first consequence of the religious unity of the mediæval period on which we shall touch, is the position which, throughout it, was held by the Sovereign Pontiff. The idea of the Papacy, inherent from the beginning, had grown through the ages by an imperceptible and natural process,—"occulto velut arbor ævo," to use De Maistre's happy quotation,—and now the royalty of Peter over the human race was distinctly manifested, and received the willing homage of the Christian peoples. "The Infinite Wisdom, which sees the end from the beginning, in decreeing the rise of an universal empire . . . decreed the development of a ruler."* The old imperial power had passed away, and in its stead had arisen the regnum Domini nostri et Christi ejus, of which the successor of the Apostle was the legislator, the judge, and the common father. "Tu es primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedec, dignitate Aaron, autoritate Moyses, judicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctione Christus,"† writes S. Bernard to Eugenius III., and these oft-quoted words are not the language of rhetoric; they do but express the serious conviction of Christendom during the seven centuries of its existence. Men "saw in the Pope not merely the type, but also the real and highest earthly organ of a power not of this world";‡ and although the actual influence of the Papacy varied with the circumstances of the time and the character of the Pontiff, the Chair of the Apostle was ever regarded as the centre of Christendom.

* J. H. Newman's "Essay on Development," c. iii. sec. iv. We do not know anything more masterly, even in F. Newman's writings, than the fourteen pages in which this point is discussed (pp. 164—179).

† S. Bernard de Consid., l. ii. c. viii. n. 15.

‡ Church's "Essays and Reviews," p. 159.

Nothing can be more misleading than the term "foreign power," which a certain school of writers on the mediæval period delight to apply to the Holy See. If used with regard to earlier centuries of that period, the phrase is absolutely unmeaning, and even in respect of the later centuries it must be taken in a very qualified sense. It is perfectly true that the Pagan spirit of nationalism and royalism was not dead; it was merely slumbering; and in the time of Frederick II. we discern its stirrings, and find evidence of its vitality. But not until the removal of the Apostolic Chair to Avignon do we see it openly challenging the sway of the idea of Christendom, and assailing the limitations imposed by the Church upon regal power. It should never be forgotten that the notion of absolute monarchy had no place in the Christian polity of the Middle Ages. Kings were bound to their subjects by constitutional pacts, of which the Holy See was the guardian, and for their due fulfilment of which, as well as for their own personal conduct, they were responsible to the Vicar of Christ. Human nature—especially in high places—is ever impatient of control. Restrictions, checking deeply-cherished schemes of aggrandisement, or thwarting overmastering passions, were galling and hateful to mediæval sovereigns, whose quarrels with the ecclesiastical power were in effect struggles to "break asunder" "the bonds" and to "cast away" "the cords" which fettered themselves and guarded the liberties of their subjects. The weakness and confusion of the Papacy during the Babylonish captivity and the great schism, were the opportunity of Cæsarism, and the several European monarchs fully availed themselves of it. The movement, which in this country found expression in the statutes against Provisors of Edward III. and the statute of Præmunire of Richard II.—we are not at present discussing the merits of those enactments—was felt throughout the whole of Christendom. In Ranke's phrase, "We see one nation after another awaken to a consciousness of its own independence and unity: the civil power will no longer acknowledge any higher authority . . . the interference of the Popes is resolutely repelled by princes and legislative bodies."* Still, even when the practical authority of the Holy See was at its lowest, the theory of its august prerogatives was unquestioned. Men looked to it, whether they obeyed it or not, as the oracle of the divine law, the organ of the just judgment of God. And, notwithstanding exceptions—some of them flagrant and scandalous—it is

* "History of the Popes," book i. c. i. sec. iv. We use Mrs. Austin's translation. The whole section is especially weighty and suggestive.

incontestable that, on the whole, the mediæval Pontiffs rose to the height of their divine mission. "It is not matter of theory," writes Mr. Church, "but a fact of history, that in the time of which we speak, the cause of the Popes was that of religion and holiness. With whatever amount of mistake, misdoing, or corruption among its supporters—however feebly they may often have realized their own principles—it was based on faith in the Unseen; it resisted and rebuked the world; it set a true value on the things of time."* Hence it was that their legislation, based on a higher reason and principles more righteous than those which informed the customs prevailing with the force of law throughout Europe, obtained general acceptance by its intrinsic excellence. Hence the system of appeals to Rome, often the object of censure as ignorant as it is passionate, was, in spite of incidental abuses, the safeguard of Christendom. For there was the recognition† of "a standard higher than that of political expediency; a commonly acknowledged law able to reach and visit crimes which national laws were ready to screen or were too weak to punish. An appeal to the See of Rome was not only virtually an appeal to the whole of Christendom, it was also an appeal to the judgment-seat of our Lord."‡

* Church's "Essays and Reviews," p. 159. The time of which Mr. Church speaks is the time of S. Anselm, but we take leave to adopt his words in a more general sense. † Ibid.

‡ There are some striking remarks on this subject in the late Mr. Phillimore's Essay on Canon Law in "Oxford Essays," 1858. We the more gladly reproduce this passage, as it is perhaps the solitary one in the essay unmarred by the fanatical prejudices of the learned writer, one of the few English jurisprudents really versed in the canon law. It is as follows:—

"The character assigned to the Bishop of Rome by the framers of the canon law is as august and venerable as any that it has ever entered into man's imagination to conceive. Europe was considered in their system as one vast moral territory, of which the Pope was the supreme magistrate, on whom the eyes of all were fixed, and to whom every one could appeal as the tutelary and incorruptible guardian of truth and justice. Beyond the reach of the clashing passions and numberless temptations by which the children of men are beset, the sole object of his authority was to secure for every Christian that future happiness which is the certain reward of virtue. For this grand end he promulgated laws dictated by the spirit of unerring wisdom, which prevented crime while they purified intention, and which no one, without violating his duty to the great European family, could venture to disobey. Greater than monarchs by his functions, humbler than the lowest by his inclinations, his officers were peace, and his exactors righteousness. Unlike the reluctant services wrung from their miserable serfs by the oppressors among whom Europe had been cantoned out, the homage which the Pope received from submissive millions was the willing, unforced obedience of grateful children; and the power he exercised was to guide the ignorant in the way, and to protect him that had no helper against the mighty and the terrible. Thus, while the face of Europe was disfigured by

Hardly less important than the legislative and judicial functions of the Pope, in the ages of faith, was his indirect temporal power as the guide and father of the Christian family. "Auctoritate Moyses," he was ever interposing between rival States and conflicting parties with the words of the leader of Israel, "Sirs, ye are brethren." It has been justly remarked by Lingard, "Writers have not always sufficiently appreciated the benefits which mankind derived from the pacific influence of the Roman Pontiffs. In an age which valued no merit but that of arms, Europe would have been plunged in perpetual war had not Pope after Pope laboured incessantly for the preservation or restoration of peace. They rebuked the passions and checked the extravagant pretensions of sovereigns. Their character, as the common fathers of Christians, gave to their representations a weight which no other mediator could claim; and their legates spared neither journey nor fatigue to reconcile the jarring interests of countries, and interpose the olive of peace between the swords of contending armies."* And the same truth has been forcibly expressed by M. Guizot: "By methods of various kinds," he writes, "the Church strove to check the tendency of society to violence and continual wars. It is matter of notoriety that by the Truce of God, and many measures of the same kind, the Church struggled against the employment of force, and devoted itself to the introduction into society of a greater degree of order and mildness. These facts are so

a thousand ridiculous and discordant customs, the offspring of violence and barbarity, there was above them all a law transcendent and sublime, guarded by sanctions which all revered, enforced by an authority which all acknowledged, by which the conqueror and the conquered, the warrior and the peasant, the layman and the priest, nay, by which the judge and the criminal who trembled before the seat of justice, were knit together in one common bond of brotherhood and affection; and if compelled by the perverseness of his subjects, he with whom this divine prerogative had been deposited was obliged to exchange the voice of paternal tenderness for that of admonition and rebuke, he addressed the wanderers like children whom he sought to reclaim, rather than as rebels whom it was his duty to chastise; nor was it till admonition after admonition had been despised, till warning after warning had been set at nought, till entreaty after entreaty had been rejected, that the spiritual sword was at length unsheathed to strike, and that, armed with the same awful power which smote 'Gehazi with a leprosy and Simon Magus with a curse,' the universal bishop and common father of Christian men, amid tears and wailing, cut off the rotten branch to save the tree, and cast out the incorrigible offender from the law's protection, and all intercourse with the species to which he was a reproach. Such was the theory of canon law."

* "Hist. of England," vol. iii. chap. ii. The occasion of Lingard's remark is the armistice concluded between Edward III. and Philip VI. in 1349, at the instance of Clement VI.

well known," he adds, "that I am spared the trouble of entering into detail regarding them."* But what is too often lost sight of, or imperfectly apprehended by those who are well acquainted with these facts, is, that the exercise of the international influence of the Pope depended upon the religious unity of Christendom. The weapons of his warfare were not carnal, but spiritual: his power was wholly moral; and its sanctions were found in the consciences and spiritual instincts of his children.

And if we turn from the political and public order of medieval Europe to its civil and domestic life, we find the consequences of their religious unity equally conspicuous and important. This is a subject so large that we can here only dwell briefly upon one aspect of it, viz. the constructive character of medieval religion. A common creed is par excellence the principle of association. It teaches men as nothing else can, to be "*unius moris in domo*." And this is pre-eminently true of the Catholic religion, with its doctrines of the one origin of the human race, of the brotherhood and spiritual equality of all baptized persons, of the absolute necessity of self-sacrifice, of the impartial justice of God, with His tribunal of penance, before which all must come in this world, and His judgment-seat awaiting all in the next. In common interests and destinies such as these, existing not as opinions or speculations, but as the prime facts of life, men found a bond of common action such as nothing else could supply. The chief obstacles to the unity of the human race in the Middle Ages were slavery and war. We have already observed how from religious unity sprang efforts, more or less successful, to repress war, or to curtail its duration, or to mitigate its horrors. As to slavery, it was felt, ever more and more deeply as the influence of the Church prevailed, that for a Christian man to hold his Christian brethren in a servile condition was monstrous. And the constant tendency of religion throughout the medieval period was to level the artificial barriers which sever man from man. As Guérard has somewhere remarked, "It made a continual appeal to the emancipation of the peoples; it brought the various grades of life together; and although men did not cease to oppress one another, still they regarded themselves as the members of one family, and were led by religious equality to civil and political equality." But this equality was not the equality of isolation; it was the equality of degree;—the equality of the many members constituting the one body. The Church certainly had no

* "Lectures on the Hist. of Civilisation in Europe," Lect. VI.

great cause to love the feudal system. It was the stronghold of her oppressors, and supplied the never-failing pretexts for their encroachments on her liberties.* But still, taking that system as she found it, her business was to bring it under the obedience of faith, and not only to adorn it with those Christian virtues which enter so largely into the ideal of the chivalric character, but also to transform it from a system of violence and brute force into "a hierarchy of duties;"—of duties strictly reciprocal, for while obedience was due from inferiors, provision was in turn no less imperatively due from superiors; of duties consecrated by a religion which was implanted in each soul—the source of its dearest hopes and of its deepest terrors.

And if religious unity was the bond of the medieval frame of civil society (which was not the Church's creation), much more was it the life of those ordinances which owed their origin expressly to her, and by which she sought to counteract the evils of the time, and to ameliorate the condition of mankind. The municipal liberties, the guilds, and confraternities of the Middle Ages sprang directly from her fertile bosom, were made in her image, and breathed her spirit. "Grave mother of majestic works," she impressed upon them her own nobleness and dignity—the nobleness of faith, the dignity of truth. Beneath the shadow of the Apostolic throne arose that glorious group of Italian republics which maintained the sacred cause of civil freedom and the liberties of the Church against Teutonic despotism, and whose greatness, built upon the common faith of their citizens, may be read in the imperishable monuments they have left us. Who, for example, can visit the "City of the Virgin" and fail to read the lesson which is written alike on her palaces and her pictures, her public buildings and her churches? "Siena," remarks Mr. Hemans, kindled by his subject into unwonted enthusiasm, "Siena seems an abstract of the Italian Middle Ages, here scarcely breathed upon by the spirit of modern times. Eloquent proofs of the domination of religion in the past, its elevating presence and all-pervading power, here meet us on every side. The whole architecture and general physiognomy of this picturesque city form a noble evidence to the civilizing influences of the Church, in her association with institutions

* Thus, as Mr. Bowden has observed, "the whole history of the imperial Franconian line is that of one long struggle between the Western Church as represented by the Papacy and the principle of a feudal classification of society . . . which threatened to reduce her to the state of a merely human and subordinate institution."—"Life of Gregory VII.," vol. x. p. 106. See also vol. ii. p. 49.

that assured municipal prosperity as well as rational freedom."* The history and character of those institutions is daily becoming better known, and they all tell the same tale. The Communal movement which shattered feudal tyranny and initiated in Europe municipal self-government is, to a great extent, traceable to the direct intervention of prelates and monks. Those sturdy burghers who rebuilt the walls and revived the civilization of the old free cities, and who, as M. Auguste Thierry observes, "went far beyond us in the pursuit of public liberties,"† ever worked under the invocation of their patron saint, and consecrated their chief corporate acts by sacrifice and prayer. The ordinances of the corporations and guilds, by which "the principle of association" was in use as "a living practice of the common folk"‡ of the Middle Ages, still remain, and are now accessible to us; and among their "most pleasing traits" their Protestant editor notes "the evidences of a simple piety and a faith that entered into everyday life."§ It was that faith, in the undoubting unity of which men lived, worked, and died, that rendered such associations possible, and upon that faith they were directly founded. And what is more curious still, and indeed well-nigh incredible in our days, is that even in guilds of the most distinctively industrial kind, the making of money was not the first object. They "set up something higher than personal gain and mere materialism," writes the late Mr. Toulmin Smith; "their main characteristic was to make their teaching of love to one's neighbour be not coldly accepted as a hollow dogma of morality, but known and felt as a habit of life."||

It would be most interesting, did time permit, to follow out into the various paths of medieval life the traces of the "elevating influence and all-pervading power" of the one religion; to mark how, as Mr. Ruskin has finely said, ¶ "Medieval art is but the expression of the joy of those

* "Med. Christianity and Sacred Art," p. 450.

† "Lettres sur l'Histoire de France," p. 6, 5th edition. "Nous avons été précédés de loin, dans la recherche des libertés publiques, par ces bourgeois du moyen-âge, qui relevèrent il y a six cent ans, les murs et la civilisation des antiques cités municipales."

‡ "The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred English Guilds," &c. Early English Text Society (Trübner), Int., p. xiii.

§ "Ibid." p. xxix.

|| "Traditions of the old Crown House," p. 28.

¶ In an unpublished lecture, quoted at page 487 of Miss Owen's "Art Schools of Medieval Christendom." We must here express our regret that this little volume, admirable from an artistic point of view, is disfigured by gross ignorance of history and theology: subjects, which Miss Owen apparently thinks "come by nature" for manifestly she has taken no pains to study them.

who have found the young child with Mary his mother ;” * how the literature of the Middle Ages, in spite of the grossness and licentiousness, which too often disfigure it, is informed by the great Christian verities ; how the poetry of common life, so rich and abundant, springs from the same source, and not only are the glories of our Lady and the deeds of the Saints the staple of popular stories, but even the exploits of the heroes and conquerors of pagan antiquity are transfigured by a heavenly radiance, and are made the subjects of Christian moralities, while “ the birds, the plants, all that man meets on his way through the world is marked by his faith and his hope.” † Nay more, how those very amusements ‡ which we now deem most distinctively secular, are made religious, and the churches serve as theatres, the Passion of Jesus Christ and the triumph of His Saints, being the subject of the pieces. All this, and much more of a similar kind, we can only glance at, and turn regretfully away.

But there is one consideration of great importance closely connected with the point we have last dwelt upon,—the constructive character of medieval religion, on which we must bestow a few words. It is this, that a main characteristic impressed upon the medieval period by Catholic unity is the spirit of the family. Christian men, as we have seen, were regarded as *domestici Dei* ; the various States were but sections of the one household of faith, Christendom ; and governments, whether regal or republican, stood in *loco parentis*. The king was the father of his people ; senates were, according to the old Roman phrase, “ *patres conscripti* ” ; the duty of obedience to civil authority was deduced directly from the precept of the Decalogue : “ Honour thy father and thy mother.” Thus it is observed by the most eloquent of Anglican divines, who, saturated as his mind was with the teaching of the great masters of the medieval schools, repeats their language in apparent unconsciousness of its incongruity in his mouth : “ This duty to parents is the firmament and bond of commonwealths. He that honours his parents will also love his brethren, derived from the same loins ; he will dearly account of all his relatives and persons of the same

* So Alfred de Musset, with his inimitable pathetic beauty :—“ autrefois, le temple des arts était le temple de Dieu même. . . Ces tableaux, ces chapelles, ces mélodies suaves et plaintives c'étaient des prières que tout cela.”—*Mélanges*, p. 4.

† Montalembert, “ *Vie de Ste Elisabeth*,” Int., p. 154.

‡ There is a curious passage on this matter in Mr. Herbert Spencer’s “ *Study of Sociology* ” (p. 136), which significantly illustrates how much the view taken of a subject depends upon first principles.

cognition ; and so families are united, and of these cities and societies are formed. And because parents and patriarchs of families and of nations had regal power, they who by any change succeeded in the care and government of cities and kingdoms, succeeded in the power and authority of fathers, and became so in law and estimate of true divinity to their people."* And this principle runs throughout medieval society. Gilds, for example, were nothing but families artificially enlarged. "The family appears as the first gild," remarks Dr. Brentano ; "or, at least, as an archetype of the gilds. Originally, its providing care satisfies all existing wants ; and for other societies there is, therefore, no room. As soon, however, as wants arise, which the family can no longer satisfy. . . . closer artificial alliances immediately spring forth to provide for them, in so far as the State does not do it. Yet . . . whatever and however diverse be their aims, the gilds take over from the family the spirit which held it together and guided it ; they are its faithful image, though only for special and definite objects."†

And here again we would point out that the secular organization of medieval Europe on this basis of the family was the direct consequence of its religious organization in the Catholic Church. It is the teaching of theology, remarks Mgr. Gerbet, that "the human race was originally intended to develop without loss of its unity. If the original fall had not turned aside the primal plan of Providence, slavery, war, barbarism, all that breaks the unity of humanity, would not have desolated the world. It would be hazardous to attempt to guess the form of organization which that development would have taken. But we may, at all events, conclude that its two constituent principles—principles which are necessarily included in the ideas of human society and unity—would have been the authority of the Father of the Family and a supreme central authority, and that between these two degrees, social hierarchs would have been established. This idea has been realized in the Catholic Church, so far as the spiritual reconstruction of the human race is concerned. The Bishops, in whom the sacerdotal character is complete, and who alone have the power of transmitting it, are the fathers of the spiritual families, centres of unity, but kept in unity by their connection with and subordination to the central paternity, the Head of the Church and Father of Fathers."‡ Thus, according to Mgr. Gerbet, whose words we

* "Life of Christ," part ii. dis. 9.

† "English Gilds," p. lxxx.

‡ "Rome Chrétienne," chap. vii.

abstract rather than translate, the constitution of the Catholic Church implies the restoration of the human race to that unity which sin and its consequences have broken. We add that the secular organization of Christendom, as contemplated by the Popes, was the complement of this idea. The revived Roman Empire was manifestly intended by them to be in things temporal what the Church was in things spiritual. The Emperor was to be the antitype of the Supreme Pontiff, whose delegate he was for secular affairs; his subordinate authorities were to correspond to the ecclesiastical hierarchy. This sublime conception was only partially realized, even under the great Frankish monarch whom Pope Leo III. associated with himself for its accomplishment. And borrowing the mournful words of the sacred writer, we may say "there arose no king like unto" Charlemagne. The imperial instruments with which the Pontiffs had to deal were generally weak and unstable, often profligate and worthless. The Holy Roman Empire was, at the best, but a splendid failure.

"Not answering the aim
Nor that unbodied figure of the thought
That gav't surmised shape";

but that thought, although unexecuted in its fulness, was still at the root of the organization of medieval society. The association of men for the various needs of civilized life was held to have something divine in it. The State was built upon fatherhood; it was a hierarchy of families; its head being the representative of Him of whom "all paternity in heaven and earth is named." Hence the supreme place which was given to the feeling of loyalty—a feeling very different in the Middle Ages from that "rational attachment to the guardian of the laws" which Junius defines it to be.* The loyalty of the Middle Ages was no matter of cold calculation; it was the spontaneous, ungrudging devotion of a child to a parent. Hence too, the extreme blackness of the crime of treason to which, as King Alfred explains,† "no mercy was assigned, because Almighty God adjudged none to them that despised Him, nor did Christ adjudge any to them which sold Him to death; and He commanded that a lord should be loved like Himself."

And here, we may observe, is the explanation of that "intolerance" of the Middle Ages which is so great a stumbling-block, not only to the anti-Christian liberalism of the day, but

* Letter I., "Loyalty in the heart and understanding of an Englishman is a rational attachment to the guardian of the laws."

† Quoted in Maine's "Ancient Law," p. 399.

also to many excellent and amiable Catholics, who fall into the error of judging of those centuries by the standard of our own. If the true constitution of medieval society is once really apprehended, its legislation against heresy no longer appears as that monstrous phenomenon which it is vulgarly held to be. To generations to which religion was the prime objective fact of life—the bond of the social and political order—heresy must have presented itself in a very different aspect from that which it wears to an age of religious individualism. "Toleration," remarks Dr. Temple,* "is the very opposite of dogmatism. It implies, in reality, a confession that there are insoluble problems upon which even revelation throws little light." The Middle Ages were beyond all things dogmatic. To the men of those times doubt as to the clearness and sufficiency of the revelation given to the Catholic Church would have seemed the most terrible blasphemy. As has been excellently observed by Mr. Piggott,† "the whole controversy is cleared of at least one element of misjudgment when we state that religious toleration was unknown at that period, and is the production of comparatively recent time." It is well to remark, in passing, that Dr. Temple's definition of toleration, although accurately representing the conception of contemporary "liberalism," is by no means historically correct. The earlier advocates of toleration did not in the least intend by it the opposite of dogmatism. They meant the sufferance, under conditions, by the dominant dogmatism of the co-existence of other forms of religious belief. "Advanced thinkers," especially those "priests of liberty," in Mr. Buckle's phrase, who minister through the journalistic press to that mass of ignorance and error which is termed public opinion—an idol as truly heathen as any in the Greek or Roman Pantheon—are great "corrupters of words." They talk of "private judgment";‡ they mean, "passive impression"; they magnify "liberty of conscience"; they mean liberty of self-will;§ they celebrate the praises of toleration; they mean Rationalism. For, as Mgr. Gerbet has truly observed, "to assert the right of every man to form by his own judgment and independent of all authority those opinions upon which his intellectual, moral, and social life depends, is Rationalism." With a large class of thinkers of the present day the existence of such a right is, of course, a

* Essay on the Education of the World, in "Essays and Reviews," p. 43.

† "Fraser's Magazine," Oct., 1875. The "period" of which Mr. Piggott is writing is that of Philip and Mary. But his words, of course, apply still more strongly to the Middle Ages.

‡ F. Newman's "Occasional Sermons," p. 149.

§ F. Newman's "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," p. 65, 4th edition.

first principle, and in surveying the medieval period, it more or less biases their judgment. Balmez* complains of the bad faith with which the question of toleration has been approached. We doubt, however, whether, in the great majority of cases, deliberate dishonesty can be imputed to the writers of whose unfairness he justly complains. Their fault rather arises from their inability to emancipate themselves from the traditions of party and the prejudices of their age. The student who has once fairly grasped the truth that to the men of medieval times the will of God, whether derived from the revelation entrusted to the Catholic Church or from "the law of nature, whereof God is the author,"† was the fount of all right and all duty—the source from which all human laws derived their obligation—will be in little danger of falling into this error. In the Ten Commandments of God is the key to the penal legislation of the Middle Ages. The notion of crime,‡ in the modern sense of the word, can hardly be said to have been current. The offences which the civil magistrate was called upon to punish were infractions of the *officia justiciæ*, prescribed by the Divine law, and were penal rather as breaches of duty than as violation of rights. In administering justice he was considered to be acting as "the minister of God," punishment being chiefly regarded as the divinely appointed sequence of crime, and its first end the vindication of the Divine honour. In the language of S. Paul, the judge was looked upon as "an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."§ And the supreme evil which a man could do was held to be the denial of the faith which God had revealed, for in it were combined all the worst elements of wickedness. It was treason against the Sovereign Lord; it was a capital injury to the commonwealth, whose prosperity depended upon His favour, *Dis te minorem quod geris imperas*, being the most axiomatic principle of statecraft: it was the most grievous of wrongs to one's neighbour, for

* "Europ. Civil," c. xxxiv.

† Hooker, "Ecc. Pol." B. I. c. viii.

‡ "Crimes," in contemplation of English law, "are the violations of rights" ("rights" being "liberties secured to the individual by the compact of civil society"), when considered in a "particular point of view, viz., in reference to the evil effects of such violation on the community at large."—Stephen's "Commentaries," vol. iv. p. 201, 7th edit.

§ "Vindex in iram ei qui malum agit."—Ep. B. Pauli ad Rom. c. xiii. v. 4. The conception now generally prevalent is very far removed from this. "The object of human punishment," writes Stephen, "is not by way of atonement or expiation for the crime committed, for that must be left to the Supreme Being; but as a precaution against future offences of the same kind."—*Ibid.*, 13.

heresy was as a canker eating away the body politic: it was worse than murder, in the degree that the soul which it slew is more excellent than the body. Jeremy Taylor has forcibly expressed this old world view. "God reigns over all Christendom," he observes, "just as He did over the Jews. . . . When it happens that a kingdom is converted to Christianity, the commonwealth is made a church, and Gentile priests are Christian bishops, and the subjects of the kingdom are servants of Christ, the religion of the nation is turned Christian, and the law of the nation made a part of the religion; there is no change of government but that Christ is made king, and the temporal power is His substitute. . . . But if we reject God from reigning over us, and say, like the people in the Gospel, *Nolumus hunc regnare* . . . then God has armed the temporal power with a sword to cut us off."* It is curious that these words should have proceeded from the pen of a writer who, in Mr. Hallam's judgment, "sapped the foundations of dogmatism," and by freeing the minds of men from bigotry, "prepared for the public toleration of differences in religion."†

Medieval intolerance then was a natural consequence of the universal prevalence of the faith, and of the supreme value which was set upon it. Coercion if not the only is certainly the most obvious way of guarding uniformity, and the men of the Middle Ages applied it as unhesitatingly in the religious sphere as we apply it in the political. Nor did it occur to them that in so doing they at all invaded individual liberty:—"Posse peccare non est libertas nec pars libertatis," says S. Anselm. "The only liberty that a man, worthy of the name, ought to ask for," observes a gifted orator of our own time,‡ "is to have all restrictions, outward and inward, removed, which prevent his doing what he ought. There is no liberty, *except* in loyal obedience." Of course the particular form which coercion assumes varies according to circumstances. Under the Mosaic legislation the divinely-appointed punishment for heresy was stoning to death. The lawgivers of the Middle Ages, who had no special revelation to guide them, prescribed for this offence the highest penalty they knew of. "The severity of the punishment of heretics," remarks Møhler, "depends clearly upon the severity of the penal laws admitted by the society of the period."§ The criminal legislation of the ages of faith appears to this generation savage and cruel.

* "Life of Christ," Pref., p. 35, Pickering's edition.

† "Literary Hist.," part iii. chap. ii. sec. 63.

‡ F. W. Robertson's "Lectures and Addresses," p. 74 (1st edition).

§ "Hist. de l'Eglise," t. ii. p. 580.

We by no means wish to defend it. The temper of the times was stern and hard. The nineteenth-century critic, living in an age when, as some one has said, physical comfort is deified, is appalled as he surveys that period from his easy-chair or his well-appointed study, and turns away in horror from what he terms its "fierce asceticism and hatred of bodily ease," shudderingly complaining that even "religion was then comprehended only as an unsparing chastiser of the flesh."* It is perfectly true that men then thought lightly of inflicting and of undergoing physical suffering. Their unquestioning belief in Him who is able "to destroy both soul and body in hell" banished the fear of "them who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." They looked upon human life as a drop in the ocean, compared with the eternity beyond; they endured, with an indifference very surprising to us, because they saw "Him who is invisible," with a clearness of vision to which we are strangers. Real earnest belief, even if it be a belief that nothing ought to be believed, is impatient of contradiction. The Communists of our own day, assassinating "les serviteurs d'un nommé Dieu;" the earlier champions of "liberty, equality, fraternity," "massacring the priests, and hurrying the laity by thousands to the scaffold or the river,"† may serve as illustrations of this fact. The Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, recognizing and directing the impulses of human nature which found expression in the system then prevailing of religious coercion, controlled, restrained, and mitigated what she neither could have nor ought to have destroyed. Then, as ever, she stood before men as "a never-failing fount of humanity, equity, forbearance, and compassion."‡

The foregoing remarks may serve to illustrate our position as to the necessity of firmly grasping and accurately estimating the great fact of the religious unity of the medieval period, in order to the fruitful investigation of its history. The most common fault in studying or writing upon the Middle Ages is that of imperfectly apprehending this fact. But there is a danger of an opposite kind to which the Catholic student is particularly exposed, and into which he often falls. It is the allowing the prime characteristic of faith which is impressed upon those ages to engross his imagination and to warp his judgment. Hence spring grave errors, pregnant with

* "Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse," edited from the Thornton MS. in Lincoln Cathedral Library, by George Perry, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln and Rector of Waddington.—Pref., vii.

† F. Newman's "Present Position of Catholics," p. 221.

‡ Ibid., p. 222.

practical results of a lamentable kind, upon two of which we shall in conclusion briefly touch. And first it is too frequently forgotten, that as in the individual so in the mass, faith is only one of the theological virtues, and may exist, nay in practice does exist, without the others. The undoubted fact, that the men of medieval times breathed an atmosphere of belief, is quite consistent with the equally indubitable fact that they perpetrated an enormous amount of wickedness. The great verities of Christianity were everywhere externally honoured and were interiorly received with unquestioning submission by the masses. All men recognized and confessed them; many turned aside from the confession to sin grossly and habitually in the teeth of them. Men's abuse of supernatural truth was rendered more flagrant by the very firmness with which they held it. *Corruptio optimi pessima*. The sins and scandals of the Middle Ages were on the same scale with their virtues. The age of Innocent III. was also the age of King John. S. Anthony of Padua and Eccelino were contemporaries. The firmest faith and the grossest corruption of life met together; nay, more, were found united in the same persons, giving birth to that rank superstition which is so marked a feature of the medieval period, and which the Catholic student is often tempted to try to extenuate. "Great men would not go out to hunt without hearing Mass, but were content that the priest should mutilate it, and worse, to bring it within limits. . . Tournaments," breathing the spirit of the ancient gladiatorial shows, "were held in defiance of the excommunications of the Church, yet were conducted with a show of devotion; ordeals, again, were even religious rites, yet in like manner undergone in the face of the Church's prohibition; . . . the Tronbadour offered tapers and paid for masses, for his success in some lawless attachment; and the object of it in return painted her votary under the figure of a saint . . . the Crusaders had faith sufficient to bind them to a perilous pilgrimage and warfare; they kept the Friday's abstinence, and planted the tents of their mistresses within the shadow of the pavilion of the glorious S. Louis."* It would be easy to fill volumes with sketches of still darker aspects of the Middle Ages; it would be easy, too, to show how much that is evil came from the forests of Germany; how much more is traceable to the ancient Paganism of Rome, which, when discredited as a religion, lived on as a superstition. But it is unnecessary to do so. It is enough to remember that the words of the Apostle, "*Mundus totus in*

* F. Newman's "*Anglican Difficulties*," p. 245.

maligno positus est," are true, not "of an age, but for all time." One period may be better than another, but there never was, and never will be, a religious nation, in the sense that the great mass of the souls which compose it are personally religious. The world may formally assume the yoke of Christ, but it will bear that yoke impatiently, for its spirit is ever the same, and when it does not openly persecute, it will secretly corrupt. If, in the medieval period, kings and nobles bowed down before the Church, on the other hand, her Bishops and Priests sometimes paid unworthy homage to the world. There is too abundant testimony that the Apostolic Chair itself was at times beset with venal and mercenary officers, and that, too, under some of the holiest and severest Pontiffs. The secular pomp and power, the high place in the social organization which the Christian State rightly conceded to the ecclesiastical order, were perilous gifts. The very power the Church exercised for the preservation of the faith of the masses, however salutary to them, was not unfrequently an occasion of falling to those who wielded it. Nay more, notwithstanding the universal profession, the general interior reception of the Catholic religion, there were from time to time terrible outbreaks of scepticism, which threatened to sap the first principles of the Christian life.

And this brings us to the second besetting error of the Catholic student of the Middle Ages,—that of forgetting the immense difference which exists between the social, political, and religious condition of that period of the world and of this,—of losing sight of the fact that the men of our day, in the various transactions of life, proceed on quite other principles than those which governed their medieval forefathers. This is the converse error to that of a large school of modern writers, who, in Mr. Church's phrase, "people past history with phantasms and colour it with lines which belong to our own days."* In turning from the Middle Ages to these times it is necessary to remember the vast change which has passed upon human society. The history of the three centuries which extend from the close of the medieval period to the French Revolution is the history of the dying-out from public life of medieval ideas: it is the history of the unchristianizing of Christendom; of the desuetude of its public law; of the banishment of religion from society. We do not know a more melancholy chapter in the world's annals than that of the gradual impairment of the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, until from the Supreme Judge of Christendom he became little

* "Essays," p. 157.

more in the political order than the ruler of a petty Italian principality.* Gallicanism, Pombalism, Josephism, were the fitting accompaniments of this change. All that had given glory and greatness to medieval civilization seemed to be dying out of the world, under the degradation and enslavement of the spiritual order, until the French Revolution, sweeping away throughout Europe old social and political forms, introduced the new era into which we have been born. The external difference between the present constitution of European society and that of the Middle Ages is very great. The opposition between their spirit is radical. The medieval world saw all things in God: modern thought sees all things in man. Then the eternal, immutable Creator was recognized as the beginning and final end of the creature; now, the world refuses to look beyond the visible scene, makes life its own object, and exalts man's mortal, ever-changing self into a present Deity; so that we may say, with a deeper meaning than the words bore upon the lips of the Attic poet,—

Δῖνος βασιλεύει τὸν Δεῖ ἑξεληλακώς.

We have already remarked upon the individualism of the popular religious conceptions of the day. The same principle has been at work with the gravest results in the social and public order. It is remarked by the greatest master of modern fiction,—who, not shrinking, alas! from the description of those things "*quæ turpe est et dicere*," has painted only too vividly the hideous realities of his age,—that the destruction of the family is conspicuous among the disastrous effects of the Revolution.† "*En coupant la tête à Louis XVI.*" he continues, "*la Révolution a coupé la tête à tous les pères de famille. Il n'y a plus de famille aujourd'hui, il n'y a plus que des individus.*" And, as he goes on to remark, there are simply two systems possible: "*ou constituer l'état par la famille, ou le constituer par l'intérêt personnel; la démocratie ou l'aristocratie; la discussion ou l'obéissance; le Catholicisme ou l'indifférence religieuse;—voilà la question en peu de mots.*" The question is stated fairly enough.

* Even at the beginning of the sixteenth century some governments had possessed themselves of no small share of ecclesiastical rights and privileges. (See Hergenröther's "*Catholic Church and Christian State*," Essay xv. part ii., and Ranke's "*History of the Popes*," vol. i. p. 25, Eng. trans.). And from the Reformation until the end of the last century, the encroachments of the civil power, to which, for fear of worse evils, the Holy See was obliged to assent, went on ever increasing until the liberties of the Church had well nigh disappeared. This is drawn out in melancholy detail in Hergenröther, Essay i. part iii. sec. 7 and 8.

† "*Œuvres de H. de Balzac*," vol. i. p. 175.

We know which solution of it has been accepted. The régime of personal interest, of democracy, of discussion, of religious indifferentism, prevails throughout Europe. The principle of individualism introduced by Protestantism into the intellectual order has been carried into the material order by the Revolution; and its logical outcome is clear enough. "I have the deepest conviction," observes Mgr. Gerbet, "that Rationalism and Communism form essentially one and the same principle in two different spheres, and that one does but realize in the region of material enjoyment what the other propagated in the superior intellectual region. Both the one and the other proclaim, under different relations, the sovereignty of the individual."* Even in the great development of industrial combination which this age has witnessed, the spirit of individualism is the leading characteristic. The guilds and corporations of the Old World are replaced by companies limited and trades unions, which, on the face of them, disclaim any object but material self-advancement and pecuniary gain. Indeed, so utterly unreasonable does it now seem to men that a supernatural end should be recognized by a trading company, that one of the most brilliant and truly representative writers of the present century thought the bare suggestion of such recognition a conclusive *reductio ad absurdum*. "If," he observes, "the doctrine that every association of human beings which exercises any power whatever is bound, as such association, to profess a religion, . . . every stage-coach company ought, in its collective capacity, to profess a religion. Railway directors must offer prayer and praise in their collective capacity. Joint-stock banks and clubs, having a personality, lie under the necessity of sanctifying that personality by the offices of religion."† Of course we are not concerned with the value of the particular arguments which Lord Macaulay is here combating. We merely wish to point to the fact that what he and the world in general in this nineteenth century deem so palpably absurd, was the universal rule of the Middle Ages. "In the accounts of the origin of the Company of Grocers," writes Dr. Brentano,‡ "it is mentioned that at their very first meeting, they fixed the stipend for the priest, who had to conduct their religious services, and to pray for their dead. In this respect," he adds, "the craft guilds of all countries are alike, and in reading their statutes one might fancy sometimes that the old craftsmen cared only for the well-

* "Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme," p. 19.

† "Essay on Gladstone's Church and State." Works, vol. vi. p. 334.

‡ "English Gilda," p. cxxxiii.

being of their souls." A fact such as this speaks more forcibly than anything else could speak of the immense difference between the spirit of this era and that of the Middle Ages; and, as we have observed, the student of medieval history, absorbed in a pursuit so full of fascination, is in great danger of forgetting this difference. The chief value of historical study is indicated to us by the hackneyed saying that history is philosophy teaching by experience; and there is no period in the world's annals more fruitful in lessons to subsequent generations than the medieval. It is, however, at the least, as difficult to apply such lessons as to learn them; and the wrong application of the lessons of medieval history is only too common. The principles which determine the relations of the Catholic Church and the Christian State are immutable. But those principles are inapplicable to an age when religious unity does not exist, when Christendom is an empty name, when in the public order faith is not found, but "only expedience as the measure of right and wrong, and temporal well-being as the end of action."* It has been remarked with calm wisdom by an illustrious German prelate, "The entirely altered circumstances of the times necessarily require a completely different ordering of the relations between Church and State. This is the object after which the present age is striving; from the time of the Reformation to the present day we have not succeeded in attaining it. The recollections of the old Catholic unity still survived in men's minds, and they endeavoured in every little state to establish things anew, in accordance with these recollections, without suspicion that the old conditions had disappeared. Hence arose, very often, a truly absurd imitation of medieval relations, and that which, viewed from the point of Catholic unity, had been grand and legitimate, became, in completely changed circumstances, unjustifiable and intolerable. The world may arrange its relations with the Church once more in medieval fashion, if, through the mercy of God, it returns once more to the unity of religious conviction. Till that time another foundation is necessary, and I can only find it in an honourable recognition of that freedom of all Christian confessions recognized in the State under the general laws."† It does not, of course, in

* F. Newman's "Discourses to Mixed Congregations," p. 157. Of course the words in the text have no application to any country in which Catholic unity is in any substantial sense still attainable.

† "Soll die Kirche allein rechtloes sein?" Ein Mahn- und Hirtenwort an die Gläubiger der Diocese Mainz, u. s. w. von Wilhelm Emmanuel Freiherrn von Ketteler, Bischof von Mainz.—Mainz, 1861, p. 30. We quote the Bishop's words as we find them, without, of course, pledging ourselves to

the least follow, because the Catholic of the nineteenth century makes the best of the condition of things in which his lot is cast, that he therefore recognizes that condition of things as good in itself, or that he has any sympathy with those wild and monstrous doctrines of the Revolution which the Holy See has authoritatively condemned.* But, as the Hindu's proverb puts it, "a fact is not altered by a hundred texts," and to spend in unavailing regrets over a past utterly gone from us, the time meant for right action in the present, is useless and worse. It is true that anti-Christian as the public order of Europe is, society is still permeated by Christian elements. It is possible that their divine working may again leaven the whole mass; that man may "find a stronger faith his own," when the dreary régime of scepticism and materialism is over, and that once again Christendom may be formed around the throne of the Apostle. Whether this shall be, "we know not, and no search will make us know." The days are evil; the horizon is dark and threatening. It is at such a time that the study of the history of the Church is peculiarly valuable as an aid to faith. A society perfect in herself and universal, the lesson derivable by her children from the whole of her past, is one of confidence and quietness; and that is the temper most needed by them in the present:

"That is the heart for thoughtful seer
Watching in trance, nor dark, nor clear,
Th' appalling Future, as it nearer draws,
His spirit calmed the storm to meet,
Feeling the rock beneath his feet,
And tracing through the cloud th' eternal Cause."

concurrence in every detail. We entirely agree with him that "another foundation is necessary" in the entirely altered circumstances of the time; but we should not describe that foundation quite as he does.

* See especially Props. lxxvii. to lxxx. of the Syllabus, for a condemnation of "*Erroris qui ad Liberalismum hodiernum referuntur.*"

ART. VI.—ENGLISH MARTYRS.

Histoire de la Persécution Religieuse en Angleterre. Par M. l'Abbé DESTOMBES. Paris. 1864.

The Condition of Catholics under James I. By JOHN MORRIS, Priest S.J. London : Longman. 1871.

Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers. Three Series. By JOHN MORRIS, Priest S.J. London : Burns & Oates. 1873-77.

Jesuits in Conflict. London : Burns & Oates. 1873.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Manresa Press. 1875.

A Calendar of the English Martyrs. By THOMAS GRAVES LAW, Priest of the Oratory. London : Burns & Oates. 1876.

THE first work at the head of this article, proves that the enthusiasm which was excited throughout Europe in the sixteenth century by the English martyrdoms, still stirs Catholic France. F. Morris has taken the lead in reviving the memory of our heroic forefathers, to whom we owe the preservation of our faith, and bringing their sufferings vividly before us. The Jesuit Records, of which "Jesuits in Conflict" is the first part, promise us a valuable history of their missionary labours in England. While F. Law in his Calendar, preceded by a masterly sketch of the whole subject, gives to the widespread devotion a practical turn, which, we trust, may lead to the general invocation of the martyrs with a view to their canonization and the spiritual work for which they shed their blood.

Nor are these the only offerings to their memory. A history of the Franciscan martyrs, a translation of Maurice Chauncey's narrative of the Carthusians, "Chronological Notes," by F. Bennet Welden, O.S.B., and a fuller history of the English Benedictines, are preparing for publication. A translation of Sanders's "Anglican Schism" is in the press. So are also the "Douay Diary," and a collection of private letters and other documents illustrative of the persecution, drawn from the archives of the archdiocese. This last will be a very important work; for, since the priests from the English secular colleges of Douai, Rheims, and Rome, far outnumbered all the other missionaries, the largest share of the toil and persecution, as well as of the crowns of martyrdom, necessarily fell to them.

These publications can scarcely fail to overthrow the three Protestant traditions,—that the English nation, even in Catholic times, hung loosely to the Church of Rome; that it became Protestant in the reign of Henry VIII., or at the latest in that of Elizabeth; and that its Protestantism was the result of religious conviction.

The first of these errors cannot keep its ground in the face of the broad fact, that for three centuries English Catholics, who long formed the majority of the nation, accepted death, imprisonment, loss of property, privation of civil rights and honourable means of subsistence, and social opprobrium and isolation, in direct defence of the Pope's authority, and for that alone.

As to the time when England became Protestant, Hallam and the best-informed writers now allow, that up to the end of Elizabeth's reign the majority of the nation was Catholic. But the details of the missionary work, as given in the books under review, the number of the missionaries, their labours among both Protestants and Catholics, and their comparative success in eluding capture, all lead us to the conclusion that, up to the end of Elizabeth's reign the majority was still Catholic; and that all through the reigns of the Stuarts the Catholics were so numerous as to hold an influential position and command general respect or fear. It would not be difficult, did our limits permit, to prove this from Strype, Wood, and other Protestant writers. Nay, even the political circumstances which led in the reign of Charles II. to the exclusion of Catholics from civil rights, are a strong confirmation of it.

Further, the details of the persecution show that it was not through conviction, but slowly and reluctantly, under forcible pressure, that England, in the lapse of generations, at last became Protestant.

We now proceed to make some observations on the characters of the martyrs.

The persecution in England naturally divides itself into two periods. During the first period, which embraces the reign of Henry VIII., the unity of the nation in faith and worship was unbroken, and the attitude of the martyrs was consequently defensive. The very idea of martyrdom seems to be absent from their thoughts. They do not press forward to grasp it, but when it comes to them they accept it calmly, in virtue of the ordinary Christian truth, that death is to be preferred to sin. Their unconscious heroism is very striking, and shows how great must have been their former state of perfection, leading on thus imperceptibly to the highest grace.

The first group of martyrs that we meet with, are the Franciscans of the Observance. They were not only the earliest sufferers, but they alone withstood Henry boldly face to face. In the first days of May, 1533, within a few weeks after Anne Boleyn had been declared queen, and while, the divorce not having yet been declared, Henry was still free, FF. Peto and Elstow preached publicly to him, warning him by the example of Ahab against his wicked advisers. The answer of Elstow on the following day to Cromwell, who threatened to throw them into the Thames, bespeaks the spirit of the Order:—"Such menaces make no impression upon us. We count it an honour to suffer for our duty, and bless God for keeping us firm under trial. And as for your Thames, the road to heaven lies as near by water as by land, and it is indifferent to us by which way we go thither."

Soon after Henry was excommunicated by the Pope unless he separated from Anne. F. Forest now argued with Latimer in defence of the Pope's supremacy in Henry's very presence, and was consequently thrown into prison. Then came the affair of Elizabeth Barton, "The Holy Maid of Kent," which had such momentous results both to their Order and to the whole nation. To her and the priests who suffered with her, especially applies the wish which we expressed in our October number, that several persons who, from over-scrupulous motives, have been excluded from modern lists of martyrs, should be restored to their original position of honour and reverence. Happily in their case no disputed principle is involved; and, in order to do them justice, it will only be necessary to discard comparatively modern Protestant traditions, and to fall back on contemporary evidence, and the admissions of enemies of the faith like Burnet and Froude. Let us glance at the facts as we thus find them.

In 1526 Elizabeth Barton, a poor uneducated girl, became a nun in the Benedictine priory of S. Sepulchre, in Canterbury. For seven years her virtues and revelations attracted great attention. "She spake very godly certain things concerning the seven deadly sins and the ten commandments";* and through her exhortations a number of priests adopted a very austere life.† Warham believed in her "many great visions"; "virtuous and well-learned priests testified of her holiness";‡ and Fisher and More, who "examined her with

* Rolls MSS., ap. Froude, "Hist. England," vol. i. c. iv. p. 297, Ed. 1858.

† Ibid., vol. ii. c. vii. p. 172.

‡ Fisher's Letter to the House of Lords, Cotton MS., Cleop E. 6, fol. 165, ap. Collier, part ii. book ii. vol. iv. p. 247, Ed. Barham.

the most nice diligence, could not by any indication find out that she was led by a spirit of fanaticism."* At length she was ordered in a revelation to tell the King, that if he "went forward with the purpose that he intended, he should not be King of England seven months later."† But as there was "no sound that by any temporal and worldly power such thing was intended, but only by the power of God,"‡ the idea of its being treason did not occur to any one.

Subsequently, in April, 1533, Anne Boleyn was declared queen. In May Cranmer pronounced a sentence of divorce. In July the Pope annulled Cranmer's proceedings, and excommunicated Henry and Anne if they did not separate before September, but he afterwards extended the time till the end of October; when Henry, disregarding the threat, was *ipso facto* excommunicate. Thus the nun's revelation was literally fulfilled. For, by the law of Christendom, which was then in force in England, an excommunicated person forfeited all his civil rights;§ and thus Henry, seven months after the execution of his intended purpose, was no longer king *de jure*, though his subjects were not yet released from their allegiance to him. The nun had now a second revelation, which, referring to this fact, said, "that Henry was no longer a king, because he reigned not of God; and that Mary, the daughter of Catherine, then regarded as one born out of lawful wedlock, would ascend the throne in her own right."||

The nun's reputation for sanctity and the widespread influence of the Observants, all of whom declared her to be inspired by the Holy Ghost, alarmed Henry; and consequently she and six priests who were her principal spiritual advisers, were sent to the Tower. These priests were Dr. Edward Bocking and John Dering, Benedictine monks of the Cathedral Priory of Canterbury; Hugh Rich and Richard Risby, Observants and Guardians of Canterbury and Richmond; and Richard Masters and Henry Gold, secular priests. After several examinations they were sentenced to stand at S. Paul's Cross while the Bishop of Bangor preached, and at the close of the sermon the King's officers gave each of them a bill, confessing themselves guilty of imposture; which bills they handed to the preacher, who read them out as their genuine

* Sanders, p. 7, Ed. Rishton; and ap. "Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica," p. 229.

† Fisher's Letter. As Fisher heard this from her own lips, and his letter would be seen by the King, his version of her revelation must be the true one.

‡ Ibid.

§ Hergenröther, vol. i. p. 307; vol. ii. p. 387.

|| Sanders, p. 7.

confessions.* But reports soon got about that they had been forced or cheated into these confessions, and the nun was detected sending messages to her friends to "animate them to adhere to her and to her prophecies."†

Meanwhile Henry, suspecting a White Rose conspiracy, had appointed a commission to institute inquiries. How these were conducted, appears from a letter of Cromwell's to Henry. Two friars had been traced to Bugden, where Catherine then lived, but no crime could be found in them. Notwithstanding Cromwell wrote: "It is undoubted that they have intended, and would confess some great matter, if they might be examined as they ought to be—that is to say, by pains."‡ But, whether with "pains" or without, no conspiracy or treason could be discovered. Even Froude is obliged to confess that it "was rather an appeal to fanaticism than a plot which could have laid hold of the deeper mind of the country."§ While Burnet reduces the whole matter to the friars having published the revelations in their sermons, informed Catherine and the Pope's ambassadors of them, and encouraged the former in her resistance to "the laws,"—i.e. to the divorce.|| In fact, the friars had been faithful to their apostolic vocation in support of justice, chastity, and the Pope's authority.

Henry having thus failed to discredit the nun and her friends as impostors, or to convict them of treason, had recourse to the old device, so often used against the Church since the hour that our Lord stood at Pilate's tribunal down to the present day, declaring the cause of God treason against the State. On the 13th of February, 1534, the nun and the six priests were attainted of treason, and several other persons, among whom was Bishop Fisher, of misprision of treason; and without any trial or opportunity for defence, the former were condemned to die. At the same time, as if to give a colour of justice to the sentence, the Act of Succession, which made it treason to assert the Pope's authority or advance anything to the prejudice of Elizabeth's succession to the throne, was passed. This Act is one of the statutes which, Hallam says, "seem from their temporary duration, their violence, and the passiveness of the Parliaments that enacted them, rather like arbitrary violations of the law than alterations of it."¶ Of similar convictions for fictitious treason he asserts: "The persons convicted could not be traitors in any fair sense of the word, because they were not charged with

* Burnet, "Hist. Reform.," vol. i. book ii. p. 251, Ed. Pocock.

† Rolls MSS., Froude, vol. ii. c. vii. p. 168.

‡ Ibid., p. 163.

§ Ibid., p. 173.

|| Burnet, vol. i. book ii. p. 250, Ed. Pocock.

¶ "Constitut. Hist.," c. i. p. 27, Ed. 1857.

anything properly denominated treason."* His words obviously clear the nun and her companions from the charge of treason, equally with the martyrs of Elizabeth's reign.

On the 20th or 21st of April, 1534, the nun and the six priests were led out to execution at Tyburn. After the nun had been hanged, as F. Risby stood on the ladder below the gallows, life and liberty were offered him if he would revolt from the Pope. But he instantly answered, "So far am I from being willing to throw off the Pope's authority, that I would rather suffer every sort of agonizing death for Holy Mother Church." He was accordingly hanged, drawn, and quartered in the usual barbarous way. F. Rich then mounted the ladder, and the offer of life and liberty on the same conditions was made to him. But he treated it as a joke, and rejected it with such scorn, that the executioners dispatched him with more than their usual cruelty.† No details of the execution of the Benedictine monks and the secular priests have come down to us. But as they were included in the same attainder and sentence as the friars, it cannot be doubted that the same offer was made to them, and their execution proves their rejection of it. At this time, probably on the same day and at this very hour, Bishop Fisher was committed to the Tower, and in the following year was beheaded for refusing to abjure the Pope's authority. The title of martyr is unanimously granted to him. How then can it be justly refused to these priests who, like him, died rather than throw off the Pope's authority?

The nun's case is distinct. The only proofs of her imposture that are brought forward, are her confession at S. Paul's, and a speech on the scaffold. But Burnet tells us that the former was not really her confession; while the latter is contradicted by contemporary evidence, is ignored by early Protestant writers, such as Stow, Speed, Godwin, and Heylin, and apparently rests on the authority of Edward Hall, the chronicler, a notoriously untrustworthy witness.‡ The inte-

* *Ibid.*, c. iii. p. 165.

† These facts are stated in the *Franciscan Martyrology* and the "Fourth Part of the *Chronicles of the Order*," both of which F. Parkinson had before him when he wrote his "*Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica*." They are also mentioned by F. Bouchier, who entered the Order in Mary's reign, and was, therefore, a contemporary. We take them from F. Parkinson and Danielle's Italian translation of F. Bouchier's "*Historia Ecclesiastica de Martyrio Fratrum Ordinis Minorum Divi Francisci*."

‡ The value of Hall's authority will be seen by reference to the Introduction to volume iv. of the "*Calender of State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.*," page 539, where Mr. Brewer convicts him of having invented the speech against Wolsey after his fall, which is generally considered such a blot on Sir Thomas More's fair name. See also pp. 504, 505, 570.

rior evidence, too, is against its genuineness. For an uneducated girl could not possibly have made a long and intricate speech, like that which we find in Holinshed and later Protestant writers quoted from Hall.* It is evidently an amplification of the confession at S. Paul's, which may be seen in the Rolls House MSS.; and, if it ever was made, it must have been in the same way as that confession, and, like it, would not have been her own act.

The opinion of her contemporaries is expressed by Sanders, who calls her the "Holy Maid" and the "Handmaid of our Lord"; † and by another contemporary writer, probably of earlier date, who places her death and those of her advisers, with those of the Carthusians, Observants, Fisher and More, in the black list of Henry's great crimes. ‡ When, in default of any trustworthy, contemporary evidence to the contrary, we consider the saintly tone of her exhortations and her uniform influence for good, the opinions of holy men like Warham, Fisher, and More before she fell into disgrace, the remarkable fulfillment of her prophecies, and the magnanimity and constancy with which she bore the mockings and insults of the mob and suffered a cruel death, § we find it impossible not to accept the verdict of her contemporaries, who awarded her the double crown of the saintly virgin and the martyr.

These martyrdoms were a fit opening of the great persecution. On the one hand, they embodied the true spirit of Cæsarism in its assumption of authority over the Church, and its denial of the supernatural and the liberty of the Apostolic office; and, on the other hand, the principle involved in the persecution was distinctly expressed, while the entire English Church was represented, the blood of the sons of S. Benedict, S. Gregory and S. Augustine, and of the sons of S. Francis, mingling with that of the secular clergy and the "devout feminine sex."

Henry had intended to strike terror into the Observants by these executions. But once more he utterly failed. In the following July the Observants at Richmond were called on to abjure the Pope's authority, but they refused to do so; and appealing to their rule, which bound them to obedience to the Holy See, they declared that in that rule they would live and die.

Then, in August, 1534, a year before the other Orders were

* Holinshed, "Chronicles," vol. ii. p. 791.

† Ap. "Collect. Anglo-Minor," pp. 229-30.

‡ Contemporary Account of Fisher and More preserved in the Vatican. Pocock, "Records of the Reformation," vol. ii. p. 362.

§ Sanders, ap. "Collect. Anglo-Minor," p. 229.

touched or any more blood had been shed, Henry swooped down on them, and shrinking from the infamy of hanging them all at once, sent them to be starved and tortured to death in prison. The contemporary writer already mentioned, says that there was an immense number of them (*ingens numerus*), and that all of them perished either on the scaffold, by starvation, or through their sufferings in prison.* Thus they vanish from our sight, their numbers and their names unknown, and leaving only the record, that not a single one of them fell from the faith.

The next group of martyrs are the Carthusians, with whom Maurice Chauncey has made us familiar. Here is the same unconscious heroism. We find no aspirations after martyrdom, but only fear of unfulfilled vocations and unready hearts when their Lord shall come, and the calm resolve to die rather than commit sin. The first thought of F. Houghton, the London Prior, a saint even before he was a martyr, is for his sons, and for himself only through them. When they are told that they will all be called on to abjure the Pope and thus cut themselves off from Christ's fold, amid the general consternation he says to them in tender paternal accents: "Very sorry am I and my heart is heavy, especially for you, my younger friends, of whom I see so many around me. Here you are living in your innocence. . . . But if you are taken hence and mingle among the Gentiles, you may learn the works of them, and having begun in the spirit you may be consumed in the flesh. And there may be others among us whose hearts are still infirm. If these mix again with the world, I fear how it may be with them; and what shall I say, and what shall I do, if I cannot save those whom God has intrusted to me."

He prepared them by a solemn penitential Triduo, "that the Lord when He knocked might find them ready." The first day he bade each choose his confessor from among his brethren. They confessed to each other, and gave each other absolution. The next day in full chapter he knelt before each of them in succession, and begged "his forgiveness for any offence which in heart, word, or deed, he might have committed against him." All did the same, "each from each imploring pardon." The third day, as he was saying the Mass of the Holy Ghost, "there came as it were a whisper of air which breathed upon their faces as they knelt. Some perceived it with their bodily senses, all felt it as it thrilled into their hearts. And then followed a sweet, soft sound of

* "Contemporary Account," Peacock, vol. ii. 563.

confessions.* But reports soon got about that they had been forced or cheated into these confessions, and the nun was detected sending messages to her friends to "animate them to adhere to her and to her prophecies."†

Meanwhile Henry, suspecting a White Rose conspiracy, had appointed a commission to institute inquiries. How these were conducted, appears from a letter of Cromwell's to Henry. Two friars had been traced to Bugdeu, where Catherine then lived, but no crime could be found in them. Notwithstanding Cromwell wrote: "It is undoubted that they have intended, and would confess some great matter, if they might be examined as they ought to be—that is to say, by pains."‡ But, whether with "pains" or without, no conspiracy or treason could be discovered. Even Froude is obliged to confess that it "was rather an appeal to fanaticism than a plot which could have laid hold of the deeper mind of the country."§ While Burnet reduces the whole matter to the friars having published the revelations in their sermons, informed Catherine and the Pope's ambassadors of them, and encouraged the former in her resistance to "the laws,"—i.e. to the divorce.|| In fact, the friars had been faithful to their apostolic vocation in support of justice, chastity, and the Pope's authority.

Henry having thus failed to discredit the nun and her friends as impostors, or to convict them of treason, had recourse to the old device, so often used against the Church since the hour that our Lord stood at Pilate's tribunal down to the present day, declaring the cause of God treason against the State. On the 13th of February, 1534, the nun and the six priests were attainted of treason, and several other persons, among whom was Bishop Fisher, of misprision of treason; and without any trial or opportunity for defence, the former were condemned to die. At the same time, as if to give a colour of justice to the sentence, the Act of Succession, which made it treason to assert the Pope's authority or advance anything to the prejudice of Elizabeth's succession to the throne, was passed. This Act is one of the statutes which, Hallam says, "seem from their temporary duration, their violence, and the passiveness of the Parliaments that enacted them, rather like arbitrary violations of the law than alterations of it."¶ Of similar convictions for fictitious treason he asserts: "The persons convicted could not be traitors in any fair sense of the word, because they were not charged with

* Burnet, "Hist. Reform," vol. i. book ii. p. 251, Ed. Pocock.

† Rolls MSS., Froude, vol. ii. c. vii. p. 168.

‡ Ibid., p. 163.

§ Ibid., p. 173.

|| Burnet, vol. i. book ii. p. 250, Ed. Pocock.

¶ "Constitut. Hist.," c. i. p. 27, Ed. 1857.

anything properly denominated treason."* His words obviously clear the nun and her companions from the charge of treason, equally with the martyrs of Elizabeth's reign.

On the 20th or 21st of April, 1534, the nun and the six priests were led out to execution at Tyburn. After the nun had been hanged, as F. Risby stood on the ladder below the gallows, life and liberty were offered him if he would revolt from the Pope. But he instantly answered, "So far am I from being willing to throw off the Pope's authority, that I would rather suffer every sort of agonizing death for Holy Mother Church." He was accordingly hanged, drawn, and quartered in the usual barbarous way. F. Rich then mounted the ladder, and the offer of life and liberty on the same conditions was made to him. But he treated it as a joke, and rejected it with such scorn, that the executioners dispatched him with more than their usual cruelty.† No details of the execution of the Benedictine monks and the secular priests have come down to us. But as they were included in the same attainder and sentence as the friars, it cannot be doubted that the same offer was made to them, and their execution proves their rejection of it. At this time, probably on the same day and at this very hour, Bishop Fisher was committed to the Tower, and in the following year was beheaded for refusing to abjure the Pope's authority. The title of martyr is unanimously granted to him. How then can it be justly refused to these priests who, like him, died rather than throw off the Pope's authority?

The nun's case is distinct. The only proofs of her imposture that are brought forward, are her confession at S. Paul's, and a speech on the scaffold. But Burnet tells us that the former was not really her confession; while the latter is contradicted by contemporary evidence, is ignored by early Protestant writers, such as Stow, Speed, Godwin, and Heylin, and apparently rests on the authority of Edward Hall, the chronicler, a notoriously untrustworthy witness.‡ The inte-

* Ibid., c. iii. p. 165.

† These facts are stated in the Franciscan Martyrology and the "Fourth Part of the Chronicles of the Order," both of which F. Parkinson had before him when he wrote his "Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica." They are also mentioned by F. Bouchier, who entered the Order in Mary's reign, and was, therefore, a contemporary. We take them from F. Parkinson and Danielle's Italian translation of F. Bouchier's "*Historia Ecclesiastica de Martyrio Fratrum Ordinis Minorum Divi Francisci*."

‡ The value of Hall's authority will be seen by reference to the Introduction to volume iv. of the "Calender of State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.," page 539, where Mr. Brewer convicts him of having invented the speech against Wolsey after his fall, which is generally considered such a blot on Sir Thomas More's fair name. See also pp. 504, 505, 570.

rior evidence, too, is against its genuineness. For an uneducated girl could not possibly have made a long and intricate speech, like that which we find in Holinshed and later Protestant writers quoted from Hall.* It is evidently an amplification of the confession at S. Paul's, which may be seen in the Rolls House MSS.; and, if it ever was made, it must have been in the same way as that confession, and, like it, would not have been her own act.

The opinion of her contemporaries is expressed by Sanders, who calls her the "Holy Maid" and the "Handmaid of our Lord"; † and by another contemporary writer, probably of earlier date, who places her death and those of her advisers, with those of the Carthusians, Observants, Fisher and More, in the black list of Henry's great crimes. ‡ When, in default of any trustworthy, contemporary evidence to the contrary, we consider the saintly tone of her exhortations and her uniform influence for good, the opinions of holy men like Warham, Fisher, and More before she fell into disgrace, the remarkable fulfillment of her prophecies, and the magnanimity and constancy with which she bore the mockings and insults of the mob and suffered a cruel death, § we find it impossible not to accept the verdict of her contemporaries, who awarded her the double crown of the saintly virgin and the martyr.

These martyrdoms were a fit opening of the great persecution. On the one hand, they embodied the true spirit of Cæsarism in its assumption of authority over the Church, and its denial of the supernatural and the liberty of the Apostolic office; and, on the other hand, the principle involved in the persecution was distinctly expressed, while the entire English Church was represented, the blood of the sons of S. Benedict, S. Gregory and S. Augustine, and of the sons of S. Francis, mingling with that of the secular clergy and the "devout feminine sex."

Henry had intended to strike terror into the Observants by these executions. But once more he utterly failed. In the following July the Observants at Richmond were called on to abjure the Pope's authority, but they refused to do so; and appealing to their rule, which bound them to obedience to the Holy See, they declared that in that rule they would live and die.

Then, in August, 1534, a year before the other Orders were

* Holinshed, "Chronicles," vol. ii. p. 791.

† Ap. "Collect. Anglo-Minor.," pp. 229-30.

‡ Contemporary Account of Fisher and More preserved in the Vatican. Pocock, "Records of the Reformation," vol. ii. p. 562.

§ Sanders, ap. "Collect. Anglo-Minor.," p. 229.

touched or any more blood had been shed, Henry swooped down on them, and shrinking from the infamy of hanging them all at once, sent them to be starved and tortured to death in prison. The contemporary writer already mentioned, says that there was an immense number of them (*ingens numerus*), and that all of them perished either on the scaffold, by starvation, or through their sufferings in prison.* Thus they vanish from our sight, their numbers and their names unknown, and leaving only the record, that not a single one of them fell from the faith.

The next group of martyrs are the Carthusians, with whom Maurice Chauncey has made us familiar. Here is the same unconscious heroism. We find no aspirations after martyrdom, but only fear of unfulfilled vocations and unready hearts when their Lord shall come, and the calm resolve to die rather than commit sin. The first thought of F. Houghton, the London Prior, a saint even before he was a martyr, is for his sons, and for himself only through them. When they are told that they will all be called on to abjure the Pope and thus cut themselves off from Christ's fold, amid the general consternation he says to them in tender paternal accents: "Very sorry am I and my heart is heavy, especially for you, my younger friends, of whom I see so many around me. Here you are living in your innocence. But if you are taken hence and mingle among the Gentiles, you may learn the works of them, and having begun in the spirit you may be consumed in the flesh. And there may be others among us whose hearts are still infirm. If these mix again with the world, I fear how it may be with them; and what shall I say, and what shall I do, if I cannot save those whom God has intrusted to me."

He prepared them by a solemn penitential Triduo, "that the Lord when He knocked might find them ready." The first day he bade each choose his confessor from among his brethren. They confessed to each other, and gave each other absolution. The next day in full chapter he knelt before each of them in succession, and begged "his forgiveness for any offence which in heart, word, or deed, he might have committed against him." All did the same, "each from each imploring pardon." The third day, as he was saying the Mass of the Holy Ghost, "there came as it were a whisper of air which breathed upon their faces as they knelt. Some perceived it with their bodily senses, all felt it as it thrilled into their hearts. And then followed a sweet, soft sound of

* "Contemporary Account," Pocock, vol. ii. 563.

music, at which the venerable Father was so moved, God being thus abundantly manifest among them, that he sank down in tears and for a long time could not continue the service.”*

We all know the end. On the 4th of May, 1535, F. Houghton and the Friars of Axholm and Beauvale were hanged, drawn, and quartered, and five of the monks on the following 14th of May and 19th of June. Ten other monks were chained in Newgate and left to starve. When Cromwell heard that they were dying off, he swore a great oath that he was very sorry for it, for he would have treated them more hardly if they had lived longer. On one of them he had his fiendish wish, though he lived not to see it. William Horne, a lay brother, survived, and after four years' cruel suffering in prison, was hanged, drawn, and quartered on the 4th of August, 1540.†

We here meet with an incident which carries us back to primitive times. Mrs. Margaret Clement, who had been brought up in Sir Thomas More's family and had thence been married to Mr. John Clement, bribed the jailer to let her visit the starving Carthusians. In the dress of a milkmaid, with a great pail full of meat on her head, she daily passed into their cell. She put the food into their mouths, for they were so tightly chained that they could not feed themselves, and she cleaned the cell and carried off the filth. But at length, the King having asked whether they were yet dead, the jailer feared to let her in. Then she persuaded him to allow her to go to the roof over their cell, where, taking off the tiles, she dropped down food on a string as close as she could to their mouths. But at last, the jailer refused to admit her at all, and she was obliged to leave them to their fate. Many years after she died at Mechlin. During the last two days of her life she often said, that she saw the Carthusians standing round her bed, inviting her to go away with them; and in their company she seemed to depart.‡

Nor was such charity rare in that Catholic age. While Mrs. Clement was visiting the Carthusians, a holy old woman daily visited and fed F. Anthony Brockby, an Observant, who lay in a cell in Newgate so dislocated and torn by barbarous racking, that he could not turn in bed nor raise his hand to his head; till, on the 19th of July, 1537, an executioner came

* Froude, vol. ii. c. ix. p. 348.

† Stow, p. 581; “*Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*,” first series, p. 24.

‡ “*Troubles, &c.*,” p. 26. Margaret, the daughter of this lady, founded at Louvain the Community of S. Monica, which is now at S. Augustine's Priory, at Abbotaleigh in Devonshire.

from the King and strangled him with the cord that he wore as a girdle.* Again, a supernatural light having illumined Newgate as F. Thomas Cort, an Observant, expired, the King, greatly terrified, allowed him to have Christian burial; when Margaret, the wife of Herbert, a shopkeeper of Ghent, Lucina-like, put a stone with an inscription over his grave at the great door of the Church of S. Sepulchre.†

Bishop Fisher's speech in Convocation in January, 1530, which we quoted at some length in our October number, shows that from the first he plainly saw, that to grant the royal supremacy was to renounce the Father of Christendom and "the unity of the Christian world, and so leap out of Peter's ship to be drowned in the waves of all heresies, sects, schisms, and divisions."‡ Far, however, from pressing on to martyrdom, he made every possible concession short of sin; as if he fondly hoped that, by a miracle of grace, a soft answer might turn away Henry's wrath, and avert the impending ruin of the Church and nation. Still, he never swerved from his original position of loyalty to the Pope and to Christian unity; and he met death with joy tempered by his habitual humility. He dressed himself better than usual for this, his wedding day. As the sun shone out full in his face, he raised his hands to heaven, saying, "Come ye to Him, and be enlightened; and your faces shall not be confounded."§ He told the surrounding crowd, that "he was come thither to die for the faith of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and he thanked God he had not been afraid of so doing; and he asked their prayers, that at the instant of the stroke which was about to be given him, he might continue steadfast, without wavering in any one point of the Catholic faith, and free from any fear." He spoke "with so cheerful a countenance, so much life and gravity, that he seemed not only free from fear, but glad to die."|| Then, with the *Te Deum* on his lips, he laid his head on the block.

Of Sir Thomas More, alone, do we hear that he longed and prayed for martyrdom. But "in the uncertainty that he was in, as he often said, whether God would give him this grace, he answered modestly" on his trial, framing his answers "on purpose that he might not deny the faith on the one hand, nor on the other court his death."¶ From the time that he was put into the Tower he prepared himself for death by penitential practices, wearing a hair shirt and using a discipline, both

* Danielle, p. 7.

† Ibid., p. 9.

‡ Lewis, "Life of Fisher," vol. ii. c. xxviii. p. 60.

§ Psal. xxxiii. 6.

|| Lewis, c. xxxvii. p. 196.

¶ Sanders, p. 21.

of which had been supplied him by Mrs. Margaret Clement ; and, finally, he went forth merrily, with his characteristic jokes up to the last moment.

Of the great Benedictine family, with its numerous branches, we know far too little. We know, however, that they were looked on as a body of reserve for the Pope,* and that their fidelity to him and their opposition to the divorce, first suggested the thought of their suppression. The few details that have reached us prove their Catholic spirit. The Abbots of Reading, Colchester, and Glastonbury, with two of the monks of the last, and the Prior of Doncaster and three of his monks, were hanged for the Pope's supremacy.† Empson, a monk of Westminster, after three years' imprisonment still refused to take the oath of royal supremacy, and was sent back to prison to die. F. Sigbert Buckley, the last surviving monk of Westminster, held firm to the faith during forty years of persecution in one gaol or another, and at last died in prison in 1610, at the age of ninety-three. The Abbot of Stratford excommunicated his monks for revealing community affairs to the King's visitors, saying, "The King can but kill me, and death is a small matter compared to perjury."‡ The Abbot of Woburn, in an hour of weakness, had abjured the Pope's supremacy. But on the next Passion Sunday, as he lay dying of a broken heart, raising himself in his bed, he exclaimed, "Would to God it would please Him to take me out of this wretched world. I would I had died with the good men that have suffered for holding with the Pope ; my conscience—my conscience grudges me for it." His words were borne to the Council. He was carried up to London. He was granted yet another chance, and he died bravely.§ In the course of fourteen years about twelve hundred monks escaped to Ireland, where they repaid the hospitality with which they were received by preaching, and strengthening the faith of their hosts. In Elizabeth's reign they were hunted like wolves and shot like carrion crows, till the few survivors from bullet, steel, nakedness and hunger, died out in the most inaccessible places. F. Latchett, a monk of Glastonbury, was imprisoned for twelve years, and tortured twenty times ; but he at last escaped, and died in the wilds of the Galtee mountains at the age of 101.||

Though we know so little about the heroic sons of S. Bene-

* Collier, vol. iv. part ii. l. ii. p. 290.

† Sanders, pp. 92, 97 ; Stow, pp. 577, 581.

‡ Froude, vol. iii. c. xiv. p. 242.

§ Ibid.

|| "Accompte of the noble English Fryers," by Paul O. Dempsey, O.S.F., ap. Burke, "Men and Women of the Reformation," vol. ii. p. 64.

dict, one thing is noteworthy. We hear of monks and well-born ladies old and young, pining and starving in garrets and hovels, begging by the road-side, and dying of hunger and cold in fields and ditches. But we never hear of excesses like those of the monks and nuns of Germany, who, throwing off their vows and breaking out of their convents, embraced the new religion.

We pass on to the second period of persecution, which opens with Elizabeth's reign. The unity of faith and worship are gone; the combat has become aggressive; and the martyr's crown and souls won to God, are now the prizes for which thousands of men and women heroically strive. The proto-martyr of this period, if we may trust Strype, was Sir Edward Walgrave or Waldgrave. He had been a devoted adherent of the Princess Mary, and he and his wife "had the character of very good alms-folks." They were both committed to the Tower on the 27th of April, 1561, for hearing Mass and having a priest in the house. Sir Edward died on the 1st of September following, and Strype says, "His confinement here was thought to have been the cause of his death."*

He belongs to a class, whose countless number and lowly position in the Church give them a special claim to our notice. They were mere persons in the world, country squires, fathers and mothers of families, mechanics, labourers, without the strengthening grace of Holy Orders and of saying Mass; and yet they practised the same heroic virtues as their spiritual superiors. So fervent was their love for our Lord, that they risked life and all that makes life dear, in order to unite themselves with Him in Mass and Holy Communion, to succour His priests, and to save the souls for whom He died.

Numerous instances of their heroism may be drawn from every class of society. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, died after ten years' imprisonment in the Tower for being reconciled to the Church. Mr. Bowes, a married country gentleman, fearlessly hurried to the assizes to save the Rev. Hugh Taylor; but being convicted of having once given him a glass of beer at his door, he was executed with him. Thomas Watkinson, a yeoman, though advanced in years and naturally timid, devoted himself to helping priests. He was urged on the scaffold to save his life and become the Queen's good subject by going to church; but he answered, "I would rather be a king in heaven than a miserable subject and bond slave to sin in this world."† Mrs. Margaret Ward daily took food

* "Annals," vol. i. c. xxiii.

† "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers," third ser., p. 183.

to the Rev. Richard Watson in prison, and at last gave him a rope by means of which he escaped from a window. Being tortured she said, "These torments are the preludes of martyrdom, with which, by the grace of God, I hope to be honoured." She was offered life and liberty if she would go to church; but she answered, "I would lay down not one life only but many, if I had them, rather than betray my conscience and my holy religion." The waterman, too, who had rowed Mr. Watson down the river and exchanged clothes with him to help his escape, accepted death joyfully. Mrs. Anne Line, an elderly and infirm widow, kept a house in London for the reception of priests. At length the pursuivants having broken in, in order to allow F. Page, S. J. time to escape, she gave herself up to them, and was flogged, tortured, and hanged; thus literally dying for him. Humphrey Prichard, a common labouring man, who for twelve years did signal service to persecuted Catholics, was also hanged. So were Carter, a printer, for printing Catholic books, and Webley, a dyer, for circulating them; and also Mr. George Errington and three yeomen for instructing a Protestant minister who betrayed them. Two ladies were condemned to be burnt for the same cause, but they were reprieved and imprisoned for ten years. Swallowell, a Protestant minister, and Pikes, a layman, were both hanged for being reconciled to the Church.

The most striking instance of this class was Ralph Miller, an old Protestant labourer, of Winchester, who, being reconciled to the Church, was thrown into prison the same day. Here he conducted himself so well that the jailer often allowed him to go out, and intrusted the keys of the prison to him. He devoted himself to the service of the Catholic prisoners, collecting alms for them, bringing priests to them, and converting many Protestants by the bright light of his virtues and his fervent prayers. On one occasion he urged F. Stanney, O.S.F., to go with him to some distance to preach and administer the Sacraments, but F. Stanney was so exhausted that he could not possibly do so. "Well, but Master," said Ralph, "we have still a great many hungry souls that want bread, and there is no one to give it them; and many also would be glad to embrace the Catholic faith. What, then, must I say to them?" F. Stanney answered that he would gladly send for a priest to help him, if he could find means to support him. Ralph joyfully undertook to do so. Mr. Dickinson, a Douai priest, came and laboured for several years, chiefly amongst the poor and the prisoners, till at length both he and Ralph were thrown into Winchester gaol. The Judge tried to persuade Ralph to go only once to church, and thus save his life for the

good of his family. But Ralph answered, "Would your lordship then advise me for a wife and children to lose my God? No, my lord, I cannot approve or embrace advice so contrary to the Gospel." At the gallows his seven children were brought to tempt him; but he gave them his blessing, saying, "I can wish you no greater happiness than to die for the cause for which I am going to die."

But death was not the only test to which Catholics were put. Imprisonment was even more trying; for in the prisons the filth, foul air, and cruel usage were beyond conception. Mr. Cooper becoming delirious through hunger, cold, and stench of the place, the Lieutenant of the Tower took away his bed, and he literally rotted on the bare floor. Nicholas Horner, a tailor, had a bad leg for which he was under surgical treatment. Notwithstanding, he was imprisoned in so damp and fetid a dungeon that the leg mortified and had to be cut off. He was then liberated, but some years later he was again taken up and hanged for making a jerkin for a priest.* Mr. Sherwood, a scholar of Douai, was racked to make him tell where he had heard Mass, and afterwards thrown into a filthy hole where he suffered from hunger, cold, and foul air. The only alleviation that Mr. Roper, Sir Thomas More's son-in-law, could obtain for him, was a little straw to lie upon. But amid his sufferings he often repeated, "O Lord Jesus, I am not worthy to suffer these things for Thee; much less am I worthy of those rewards which Thou hast promised to such as confess Thee." He was at length hanged.

Exorbitant fines also were exacted of Catholics, and in default of payment they were imprisoned. Their houses were searched at all hours of the day and night by a crowd of ragamuffins, who ransacked, broke, spoiled and pilfered, and sometimes even pulled the house down. In the reign of James I. they were assigned to favourites of the court to "make profit of";† and the assignee was thus authorized to extort for his own benefit whatever he could wring out of them in addition to the regular fines to the King.

To appreciate fully the courage and joy with which Catholics suffered, it should be borne in mind, that at any moment a single word against the Pope, or a promise to go to church, often only once, would have restored them to life, liberty, and ease. But, on the contrary, we constantly see them kissing the rope, the hurdle, and the gallows, returning thanks to

* "Calendar," p. 12.

† Dodd, "Church History," vol. iv. p. 75, Ed. Tierney. Lists of the persons thus assigned and the assignees are to be seen in the State Paper Office.

God, and to the judge and jury who condemned them, or mourning if they were acquitted or reprieved. The mother of Mr. Body, on hearing of his execution, even invited her neighbours to a feast, in honour, as she said, of his marriage, by which his soul was eternally espoused to the Lamb.

Such heroism was generally the crowning grace of a life of humility, mortification, purity, and prayer, of which numerous examples occur at this period. In the third series of "*The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*" will be found most interesting details of the saintly life of Mrs. Margaret Clitherow. F. Pollard's "*Reminiscences of the Yorkshire Mission*" from 1607 to 1610, in the same volume, show how great was the charity of Catholics generally in opening their houses to all priests who came to them, and towards the poor in their neighbourhood. He describes, as an instance of the sort of life led by Catholics, the family of Sir Ralph Bathorpe, of Osgodby, in the East Riding, which was regulated almost like a religious house. It is striking to notice how many Catholics of the highest families, sons, daughters, widows and widowers, and sometimes even married couples by mutual consent, entered religion.

In spite of persecution the number of Catholics was long kept up. F. Pollard says that they increased rather than diminished, and that in riding from Lincoln to thirty miles beyond York, he would find at every three, or at most six miles, a Catholic house, generally belonging to persons of good position. Another proof of their number is the constant presence of so many priests, and the celebration of Mass all over the kingdom. A further proof of their number and fervour is the fact, that at the time when the marriage of Charles I. with the Infanta was being negotiated, 4,000 of the Catholic laity were liberated, some of whom had been imprisoned for twenty-six, and others for thirty-eight years; and yet Chancellor Williams declared that no priest or capital offender had been released.* We have unfortunately not even a proximate idea how many of the laity died, whether on the scaffold or in prison, but the martyrs must have amounted to hundreds, or even thousands.

Still, persecution gradually did its work. In the prisons Catholics were constantly assailed by Protestants; their weak points were discovered, and corresponding temptations were offered. The history of Anthony Tyrrell in the second series of "*The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*," is a striking

* Prynne's "*Hidden Works of Darkness*," p. 13. MS. in State Paper office, ap. Dodd, "*Church Hist.*," vol. v. pp. 121, 296.

instance of the moral torture thus inflicted on a weak man, whose faith was too deeply rooted to be shaken. Sometimes Catholics, worn out by suffering, gave up in despair; or, sometimes the wife would be a Catholic and the husband a Protestant, who, after many years' confinement, would get her released on giving a bond that he would force her to go to church. It can easily be conceived what sort of religious education the unhappy children in both these cases would receive. Many of the Catholic gentry were driven abroad, and their dependents were left at the mercy of Protestant landlords. The Government, too, seized every opportunity to separate poor Catholics from their natural protectors. Thus, Lord Montague having baptized his new-born child rather than take it to the church, was sentenced, though in favour at court, to dismiss all his Catholic servants.

The Acts of the Ecclesiastical Commission of the North, to which F. Morris refers us, show how the persecution continued unremittingly day after day, and year after year; till at length, as generation after generation died out, worldly or weak parents, who had been tempted to conform occasionally, as they probably thought only for a season till better times should come, gave place to children who had been brought up, at the very best, in a halting faith between God and the world. Thus was it that by the gibbet, vivisection, imprisonment, starvation, poverty, bodily and moral torture, the English people were robbed of their faith and reluctantly became Protestant.

We now turn from the flock to their pastors. The first martyr-priest, if we accept Strype's evidence, was William Blagrave, who was hanged, May the 10th, 1566.* He was one of that noble band of Marian clergy, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, and seculars, the forlorn hope of Catholic England, who kept up the faith for fifteen years. One of the most distinguished of these was Lawrence Vaux. In 1566 he was sent from Rome with Dr. Allen and Nicholas Sanders to promulgate the decision of the Fathers at Trent, declaring it a mortal sin to go to the Protestant Church. Hundreds of persons who had conformed in ignorance, were now reconciled. His preaching was so successful that after some years he was obliged to retire to Louvain, where, in 1572, he received the Augustinian habit. In 1580 he returned to England, but he was arrested within two days and imprisoned in Westminster Close. Early in 1584, the Government having discovered that he was the author of a catechism

* Strype, vol. i. c. xix.

which was circulating widely, he was removed to the Clink, where he was starved to death.*

In 1574, four priests from the College at Douai made their appearance, and six years later the number of those from Douai, Rheims, and Rome, amounted to one hundred. So bad, however, were the prospects of the mission, that even the Jesuits held back. But nothing could dispirit Dr. Allen, who deemed the dangers trifling, since out of fifty priests sent over in one year, only ten had been imprisoned.† When Campian asked him, whether any good he could do in England would counterbalance the labour and risks, and the loss sustained by the flock whom he should leave in Bohemia, he answered, "First, what you have been doing in Bohemia may be done by others of your Order. Secondly, you owe more to England than to Bohemia. Thirdly, the recovery of one soul from heresy is worth all your pains. And finally, the reward may be greater; for you may be martyred in England, which you cannot easily be elsewhere."‡ This answer removed all hesitation. In 1580, Campian, accompanied by Persons, came to England. The hopes held out to him by Dr. Allen were fully realized; he had his part in the rich harvest of 10,000 souls said to have been recovered during that year to God, and after a brief Apostolic career of a single year, into which the merits of a long life were compressed, he won his crown. By 1596 there were 300 Seminarists, 16 Jesuits, and 50 survivors of the Marian clergy, on the mission. Already there had been 105 martyrs, of whom four were Jesuits; and above 100 priests had been banished.§ The Benedictines in England had been reduced to a single monk; but in 1606 new life was infused into them by the foundation of an English congregation at Douai. The Franciscans had never lost their hold on England; but in 1616 they were reinforced by the restoration at Douai of the English province of their Order. Each of the religious Orders had its own college and noviciate; but priests and students from the English secular colleges often entered their ranks. F. Campian studied for two years at Douai, F. Arrowsmith was on the mission for ten or eleven years, and F. Pollard for three years, before they all three became Jesuits. F. Briant, whose missionary life belongs to Douai, made a vow before his death to enter the Society. F. Tunstall made a similar vow to enter the Benedictine Order. F. Barkworth also became a Benedictine, and F. John Genings, F. Wood-

* "Rambler," new series, vol. viii. p. 99.

† "Jesuits in Conflict," p. 188.

‡ Challoner, "Missionary Priests," vol. i. p. 64.

§ "Calendar," p. 7.

cocke, and F. Wall, Franciscans. Thus, in these and other similar cases, the glory of the martyr is shed alike on the secular college and the religious Order.

The hope of martyrdom drew men of all ages and classes to the seminaries in such numbers, that Dr. Allen was often at his wits' end how to feed them. Each martyrdom was celebrated at college by a Mass of thanksgiving and a solemn *Te Deum*; and the students encouraged each other in the words of young Edmund Genings, "*Vivamus in spe.*"*

Animated by this spirit, Everard Hanse, a Douai priest, whose sufferings in prison had been so great that his being yet alive seemed a miracle, wrote to his brother, "The comforts of this present moment are unspeakable; the dignity is too high for a sinner The day and hour of my birth is at hand, and my Master saith, 'Take up thy cross and follow Me.'" So, too, Alexander Briant, while needles were thrust under his nails, said the *Miserere* with a smiling countenance and asked God to forgive his tormentors. Whereupon Dr. Hammond, the chief of them, stamped and stared as if beside himself, crying out, "What a thing is this! If a man were not settled in his religion, this were enough to convert him." And when he was racked, he laughed at the torturers, saying, "Is this all you can do? If the rack is no more than this, you may bring a hundred more for this matter."† So, too, F. Tunstall, when the judge tried to frighten him by describing the details of his punishment, answered, "*Deo gratias*"; adding with a smile, "Why, my good lord, this whole dreadful sentence means but one death; and I do assure you, by God's grace I am not ashamed nor afraid of death, come when it will."

Similar courage and joy appear in many other martyrs, whom we constantly see gazing with eager longing on the sufferings of their fellow-martyrs, embracing their dead bodies, and kissing the bloody hands of the executioner and the instruments of their own impending torture. Words fail to express the bitter disappointment and life-long regret of F. Atwood, O.P., who was actually on the hurdle on his way to the scaffold when he was reprieved, and thus saw the crown that was almost in his grasp, snatched away.

The Church in her office for Abbots annually reminds us, that the higher be the grace to which we aspire, the deeper must the foundations of humility be laid. In the solemn *Triduo* of the Carthusians, the lowliness of Fisher, the penitential exercises of More, we see the depth of the humility by

* "*Calendar*," p. 10.† "*Jesuits in Conflict*," p. 186.

which the English Church prepared herself for her mortal conflict with the powers of darkness. The height of heroic virtue to which she attained, is expressed in the address of F. Whitebread to the Jesuits at Liege, in July 1678. His words were uttered in a season of peace, which had lasted for eighteen years and promised to become permanent. But there breathed in them a supernatural warning of the coming storm, which in the very next month burst upon the Church in connection with Oates's plot, and in which none suffered so severely as the Jesuits. Preaching on S. Matt. xx. 22, he apostrophized them: "Can you drink of the chalice that I shall drink of? Can you undergo a hard persecution? Are you contented to be falsely betrayed, and injured, and hurried away to prison? We can, blessed be God. Can you drink of the chalice that I shall drink of? Can you suffer the hardships of a gaol? Can you sleep on straw, and live on hard diet? Can you lie in chains and fetters? Can you endure the rack? We can, blessed be God. Can you drink of the chalice that I shall drink of? Can you be brought to the bar and hear yourselves falsely sworn against? Can you patiently receive the sentence of an unjust judge condemning you to a painful and ignominious death, to be hanged, drawn, and quartered? We can, blessed be God."* On the 20th of the following June, F. Whitebread and four of his brethren sealed their heroic profession with their blood at Tyburn, and in the course of the persecution for the plot many other Jesuits died either on the scaffold or of cruel usage in prison.

It is hard to choose among men, so many of whom were saints even before they were martyrs. But as our limits compel us to select, we pass reluctantly over the Jesuits, simply on the ground that their heroic virtue is so universally known, that it has made their name a by-word among both friends and foes. On them fell during the latter period of persecution the chief brunt of the fight; they had the honour to be first mentioned in the Act of Parliament directed against "Jesuits and Seminary Priests," and also to be alone excluded from the benefit of the Act of Catholic Emancipation; and therefore they need not our poor eulogium. For this reason we prefer to call attention to the zeal and sanctity which lay hid in hundreds of men, whose names do not figure in the political history of the times, who laboured chiefly among the poor, but of whom scanty memorials remain. Many of these, whose very names are hardly remembered,

* Challoner, vol. i. p. 370.

afford us edifying examples and instruction as saints, even apart from their having been martyrs.

To this class belongs William Andleby, a Yorkshire gentleman, who was brought up with great prejudices against the faith; but having called on Dr. Allen in order to convince him of the absurdity of his religion, he found the tables turned on him, was reconciled to the Church, entered the college at Douai, and some years later came on the mission. He laboured chiefly among the poor, travelling on foot, meanly dressed, and carrying in a bag his vestments and other things for saying Mass. His love of souls was so great that he spared neither toil nor risk in their service. Not being allowed to see or speak to the Catholic prisoners in Hull Castle, except in the presence of the jailer who was a great enemy to the faith, he managed several times, in spite of moats and walls, gates and bars, to get secret access to them and afford them spiritual consolation. He led a very austere life, watching and fasting, never speaking, unless the glory of God required it, and so constantly absorbed in prayer that he often exposed himself to suspicion by taking no notice of those whom he met. After labouring for twenty years, he was hanged, drawn, and quartered on the 4th of July, 1597.

William Ward, a priest from Rheims, also was devoted to the poor. He laboured chiefly in garrets and cellars, dressed shabbily, ate the commonest food, and in every way placed himself on a level with the poor, who were the special objects of his affection. He led a very austere life, and was so inflamed with zeal for souls that he was never weary of preaching and hearing confessions. When he was above eighty, the persecution under Charles I. being renewed, his nephew tried to persuade him to retire to a place of safety. But he answered indignantly, "I am not one of the hireling shepherds who fly at the approach of the wolf, and abandon their sheep to its ravenous fury." He was executed on the 26th of July, 1641.

Nicholas Postgate, a Douai priest, also devoted himself to the service of the poor. He laboured in Yorkshire for fifty years, living, till he was eighty-six years of age, in a hut, sheltered by snowdrifts alone, on Egton Moor, near Whitby. Here he led an almost angelic life, marked by sweetness, serenity, and an insatiable zeal for souls, a thousand of whom he reclaimed from heresy or sin. He was martyred for the so-called Popish Plot in 1679.

F. Ambrose Barlow, O.S.B., also, was remarkable for love of the poor, zeal for souls, and constant union with God. He refused to live in great families, and preferred a common

farmhouse in order that the poor might have easy access to him. Night and day he was occupied praying, preaching, administering the Sacraments, or painting pictures of our Lord and His blessed Mother, which was the only recreation that he allowed himself. It was his habit, in imitation of primitive ages, to assemble his people at the principal festivals, and pass the night with them in watching, prayer, and hearing confessions; and the following day he would give them a feast, when he and the richer members of the flock waited on them, and dined off their leavings. He had a great devotion to our Blessed Lady, and daily said the Rosary; and also to the Passion, to which he united himself by praying with his arms extended in the form of a cross. He always received such light and strength in mental prayer, that when the time set apart for it approached, he experienced sensible joy, as if he were going to a feast. He had a great longing for martyrdom, so that when his friends remonstrated with him for going about publicly where he was well known, he answered, "Let them fear who have anything to lose which they are unwilling to part with." Notwithstanding, when he had a paralytic seizure and seemed to be at the point of death without a priest to give him the Sacraments, he made a heroic act of submission to the will of God, saying, "Lord, Thy will be done. Conformity of our will to Thine is to be preferred to the grace of the Sacraments, and even to martyrdom itself." A priest, however, unexpectedly arrived, and he partially recovered. The following year, on the 10th of September, 1641, he was martyred at Lancaster.

John Southworth, a Douai priest, was so indefatigable in his labours in the most wretched parts of London, where he converted many Protestants on their deathbeds, that he was called the Father of the Poor. His zeal excited against him the hatred of the Puritans; but he was generally so much beloved and revered, that in June, 1654, when at the age of seventy-two he was condemned to die, Serjeant Steel, Recorder of London, after trying in vain to induce him to deny his priesthood, was so drowned in tears that for a long time he could not pass sentence on him.

George Nappier, also, was remarkable for his heroic charity. When the plague was raging at Douai, he got leave from his superiors to nurse six of his fellow-students in the college who were infected. In England he always went about on foot, meanly dressed, with a wallet on his back. Happening one day to meet a poor man in rags, he took off his cloak and put it on him; and when his companion remonstrated that the man would spoil it with vermin, he answered, "It is much

better that he should spoil it with vermin than I with moths." When he was in prison he was constantly giving away his clothes ; and when his friends suggested that, should he be pardoned, he would have none for himself, he answered, "I have more on my back than I brought into the world ; and if I live I will cast myself on God's providence." He was again and again reprieved, and his life would probably have been spared, had he not reconciled a Protestant fellow-prisoner, who asked him for advice how to save his soul, and at the gallows declared himself a Catholic. When the Vice-Chancellor reproved him, saying that this act would hurry his own execution, he bade him tell the judges that if they would give him the same opportunity he would do as much for them. The night before his execution he gave a supper to several poor Catholics, and sent money to all who had been accessory to his death. He was executed at Oxford, November 9, 1610, and his head was set up on Christchurch steeple. Many small springs broke forth close to the wall at Christchurch, where one of his quarters hung, and especially one under his hand, as if in token of his great charity ; and when it was removed the springs dried up.

F. John Roberts, O.S.B., also, displayed heroic charity during the plague in London, when he ministered to those who were infected, and converted many souls from heresy and vice. He was distinguished by the perfection of his interior life, of which he is proposed as a model in the "*Liber Apertus*," by Dom. Amandus Kaiser, O.S.B. During the ten years that he was on the mission he was banished four times, but immediately returned. He was at last condemned to be executed with Mr. Somers, a secular priest, December the 10th, 1610. The night before his execution Doña Luisa de Carvajal gave a supper to the Catholic prisoners, and sat between the two martyrs at the head of the table. Scarcely any one thought of eating ; for the martyrs were shedding tears of joy at the thought that in a few hours they would be sitting at the banquet where God Himself ministers to His elect, while the others gazed at them with holy envy and longing to share their happiness. During the course of the evening F. Roberts consulted Doña Luisa whether he was not giving scandal by his "great glee." But she quieted his scruples, saying, "You cannot be better employed than in letting them all see with what cheerful courage you are about to die for Christ."

Many of the martyrs afford us edifying examples of mortification, union with God in prayer and spiritual joy, whereby they exercised extraordinary influence on all around them.

F. Heath, O.S.F., especially, is distinguished by his close

union with God. He never ceased praying, except to read or for works of charity, and from these he returned at once to prayer, literally fulfilling our Lord's command to pray always. He had a great devotion to the Passion, and received many favours from uniting himself with it in prayer with his arms in the form of a cross. His relations to our Lady were like those of a little child to its mother, confiding to her all his troubles, and leaning tenderly on her for assistance and support. From humility he begged the Provincial on his knees not to send him on the English mission. But no sooner did he hear of the revival of persecution in 1641, than day and night he saw, as it were, the executioner placing the longed-for cord round his neck; and he piteously besought leave to go and die with his brethren for his English brothers in the flesh. When at length he had overcome the opposition of his superiors, he seemed to be another man. Heavenly beauty shone in his face, and he constantly spoke with supernatural joy and feeling of the glory of the martyrs, as if he had already a foretaste of it. He was arrested the very day of his arrival in London, and was crowned with martyrdom on the 27th of April, 1643.

F. Roe, O.S.B., also, was remarkable for his application to mental prayer. He instructed his penitents in it orally, and translated and published several works on the subject. His zeal and charity made him careless of all risks, and he consequently passed the greater part of his missionary life in prison. He was for a few months in S. Alban's gaol, where he nearly perished through cold and hunger. He was then removed to the Fleet, but often getting out on parole, and using every opportunity, whether in or out of prison, for the salvation of souls. The morning of his execution, January 21st, 1642, after celebrating Mass, he said to those who were present, "When you see our arms stretched out and stiff, and nailed to the gates of the city, imagine that we are giving you the same blessing that we give you now; and when you look upon our heads fixed upon London Bridge, think that we there preach to you the very same faith for which we are about to die." He walked down the prison steps to the hurdle with the air of a conqueror. As he got into the hurdle he said to a friend's servant in the crowd, "Commend me to your master, and tell him that you met me on a cart without wheels going to a place where I can pray for him."

His companion on this occasion was Thomas Reynolds, who was naturally so timid, that when he was first on the mission, there being an alarm of pursuivants one day when he was in bed, he was so terrified that he could not get his clothes on to

go and hide himself. But such was the triumph of grace in him, that he laboured on the mission above fifty years, the last fourteen of which he spent in prison; and though he was often banished he returned again immediately, his natural infirmity having no power except to make him more humble. The eve of his martyrdom God left him for a short time to himself, and deeply humbled, he besought his Catholic friends to stay and help him with their prayers. But the next morning his very face seemed radiant, and the triumph of grace over nature shone forth in his whole appearance.

When he and F. Roe were placed in the hurdle, F. Roe, making the sign of the cross, said to the driver, "Gee-up, coachman." Passing a poor Catholic, shivering with fright, he said, "Don't be troubled to see me here. I am riding in state to a great feast." Thomas Reynolds conducted himself with equal courage, and spoke with such sweetness, forgiving all his persecutors, and thanking the sheriff for his kindness, that the latter said in a low voice, "And I commend myself to you." When they reached Tyburn they confessed to each other, and after mutual embraces and congratulations they saluted the people with such evident joy, that a Protestant in the crowd said, "It will be long before any of our religion will die as these men do for their faith. They will sooner turn to a hundred religions." A Protestant nobleman also said, "When Mr. Ward was executed a thousand were made Papists, and two thousand more will become Papists for these two priests."

F. Philip Powell, O.S.B., set an edifying example by his mortification, and his carefulness in consulting our Lady, S. Benedict and his guardian angel, and humbly following their inspirations. In prison he put a stop to all swearing. He reconciled six of his fellow-prisoners, and all of them, twenty-nine in number, drew up a certificate of his innocent and virtuous behaviour. He was appointed to sweep the ward, which he did with great delight; and when one of his converts would have relieved him he would not consent. He was so beloved that the officer who came to tell him that he was to die, was so overcome that he could not read the sentence. But F. Powell, looking over his shoulder, prompted him; and when it was finished he called for a glass of sack, and drinking to the officer and thanking him, said, "What am I that God thus honours me?" The man, too, who had to drive away the cart from under the gallows, hid himself in the crowd to avoid the painful task, and another was obliged to do it.

Several other points of interest come out in the history of

the martyrs. Their unblemished loyalty to the sovereign was truly supernatural, for there was little natural ground for it. It is wonderful, too, how impossible they found it to convince Protestants of the self-evident truth that laws which are opposed to the law of God must not be obeyed. One of the judges of F. Bullaker, O.S.F., actually said, that it would be wicked to preach Christ to the Turks if it were against their laws.

Then again it is curious, especially in connection with the present Anglican controversies, to find that they could never persuade their judges that our Lord being a priest, and having offered a sacrifice of Himself on the cross, the Christian religion must necessarily have both priests and a sacrifice. F. Maurus Scott, O.S.B., hit Abbot, Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, very hard on this point, convicting him out of his own mouth of his want of orders. As the Bishop was urging him to confess whether he was a priest or not, F. Scott, turning on him, said, "My lord, are you a priest?" "No," answered Abbot. "No priest, no bishop," replied F. Scott. "I'm a priest," rejoined Abbot, "but not a massing priest." "If you are a priest," said F. Scott, "you are a sacrificing priest, for sacrificing is essential to priesthood; and if you are a sacrificing priest, you are a massing priest. If, then, you are no massing priest, you are no sacrificing priest; if no sacrificing priest, no priest at all, and consequently no bishop."

The last martyr who died on the scaffold was Oliver Plunkett, O.S.B., Archbishop of Armagh. The Fathers of the Oratory, in whose London house the recent Process for the canonization of the martyrs was held, may, to some extent, claim a share in him. For F. Peter Francis Scarampi, Superior of the Roman Oratory, having been sent to Ireland in 1643 by Pope Urban VIII., brought young Plunkett, then sixteen years old, back to Rome, where he lived at the Chiesa Nuova till Scarampi's death in 1656. He then joined the little community at S. Girolamo, in which S. Philip had long lived, but continued in the closest friendship with the Oratory Fathers. After spending five-and-twenty years in Rome he was sent back to Ireland in 1669 as Archbishop of Armagh. There he lived in great poverty, in a thatched cottage, with only one servant, and an income never exceeding £60 a year. By his virtues he not only gave great edification to the Catholics, but won the esteem of the Protestants. Notwithstanding, he was accused of complicity in the Popish Plot, and without the least shadow of proof, was executed at Tyburn on the 1st July, 1681.

But though priests were no longer executed, they continued for nearly another century to be subjected to life-long imprisonment for saying Mass. The last priest tried for his life for saying Mass was the Hon. and Right Rev. James Talbot, brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, who was tried in 1769, and was acquitted only for want of evidence. The penalty of death for saying or being present at Mass remained in force till 1780, and Catholics continued to suffer under civil disabilities till 1829.

As Catholics have gradually settled down in peace after three centuries of persecution, their thoughts have naturally turned to the martyrs to whom they owe such a heavy debt of gratitude. Three years ago the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster instituted a process for their canonization, which was completed in due form at the London Oratory, and the acts were forwarded to Rome in 1874.

We cannot close these remarks better than in the words of F. Law* :—

These are the men whom God's Providence has raised up amongst us for our example and our delight. They belong to us, and appeal to us, as no others can. Their blood has hallowed the soil on which we stand. Their precious relics are still in abundance preserved in our colleges and convents, and have by constant miracles borne witness to the efficacy of their prayers. One thing alone is wanting to complete their glory and our consolation—that they should be raised upon the altars of the universal Church by a solemn decree of the Sovereign Pontiff. May we not pray that it may be reserved for our Holy Father, to whom England owes so much, to confer yet one more blessing on our country by the solemn beatification of these our martyrs?

* "Calendar," p. 14.

ART. VII.—F. AUGUSTINE DE BACKER.

La Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus et le P. de Backer.
Par P. VAN TRICHT, S.J. Louvain ; C. Fonteyn, 1876.

A CHIEF rule of the Society of Jesus binds its members not merely "to seek, with God's grace, their own salvation and perfection, but also to labour, with the help of the same grace, for the salvation and perfection of their neighbours."* Did we desire to write an apology of the Jesuits, we might take this rule, and dividing it into two natural divisions, show from history how gloriously both its parts had been fulfilled. A bare list of the Saints of the Order whom the Church honours on her altars, or a plain unvarnished tale about the deeds of its missionaries would more than suffice to show the soldierlike fidelity with which its members had obeyed the commands of their chief. Or, if we wished by documentary evidence to prove the zeal with which the second half of the same rule had been kept, we should point to the thousands of volumes written by members of the Society. Those volumes crowd, and until recently, encumbered every public library of Europe. We say until recently encumbered, for what is the use of a great pile of books without means to find what is in them? What is more tantalizing than a large and well-stocked library without a catalogue? What is more annoying than a host of valuable volumes without a bibliographical work to indicate their respective worth? Our lives are too short, and even if they were longer, our times are too hurried and impatient to allow us to make personal acquaintance with even a small section of the works the printing-press has given to the world. We want a guide to the mines of treasures that exist beneath heaps of dusty folios, and seemingly valueless paper. The literature produced by the Jesuits has long been demanding such a guide. Even in the early days of their Order such a one was sought for. Generation after generation, there came forward those fit for the post, but before they had made themselves familiar with its duties, death overtook them. One by one they came, they laboured,

* Finis hujus Societatis est, non solum salutem et perfectionem propriarum animarum cum divina gratia vacare, sed cum eadem impense in salutem et perfectionem proximorum incumbere.—*Summarium Constitutionum*, 2.

and passed away, leaving to this nineteenth century the glory of producing the bibliographer of the Society of Jesus in the person of Father Augustine de Backer.

The Society had not kept even its first half jubilee when its earliest bibliographer could write, with an excusable pride, as follows:—"What branch of science or letters have our fathers neglected? What subjects have they left unstudied? What ones have not their writings expounded, enriched, and embellished?" So wrote Ribadeneira, one of the early companions of S. Ignatius, and one who from his great qualities of heart and mind had fittingly been chosen to fill many and various high posts in different parts of Europe. This enabled him in his bibliography to speak from personal knowledge of most of the writers about whom he treats. Although this makes his book more valuable to the historian, it lessens its worth to the bibliographer. It has filled it with much that is foreign to bibliography. Ribadeneira does not seem to have heeded this, for he went further, and added to his work an account of those Jesuits who had suffered for the faith. We must bear in mind, however, that the science of bibliography was then still in its childhood. Moreover, the words that end the preface to Ribadeneira's book show us what was the aim of its author. "Farewell, kind reader, and love us." Such are his words. He wrote to show men the claims that his Order had on their affections. His first attempt at bibliography was merely a small catalogue of a few pages, published in 1602. No copies are now known to exist. Six years later, his larger and more complete work, entitled a "*Catalogus Scriptorum Religionis Societatis Jesu*," was printed at the press of Moretus, at Antwerp. The Jesuit Fathers in France and Italy alike found it incomplete. Therefore, several fresh editions of it appeared. The best was issued by Plantin, in 1613. Though in reality the fourth, it is described on the title-page as "*editio secunda*." F. Schott, the well-known Hellenist and philologist, superintended its publication. The next to walk in the footsteps of Ribadeneira was, twenty years later, a Belgian Jesuit, by name D'Alegambe. Circumstances had enabled him to get together many materials of much value for his work. In their arrangement, there was great improvement on the method followed by his predecessor. At first, owing to certain rather rigorous decrees of Urban VIII., the Roman censorship would not allow D'Alegambe's MSS. to be printed. He appealed to the Pope. A commission examined the work, and permitted its impression, on condition that the author inserted a protest at the beginning of his book. Since then, many books which the decrees of Pope Urban VIII. would not have allowed

to be printed have, by the use of this protest, been permitted publication. The protest is to the effect that the author in all he relates, and more especially in regard to events of a marvellous nature, in no wise desires to forestall the judgment of the Church to whom he submits all his writings. The appearance of D'Alegambe's work was the signal for many attacks on it. Nevertheless, it may be reckoned the best work of its kind which had, until then, been written. Even now-a-days, F. de Backer did not hesitate to say "though it had its faults, it was the best bibliography of its times."

The notes, which subsequently to the publication of this book, D'Alegambe had amassed, were after his death given to F. Nathaniel Southwell. He was a native of Norfolk, entered the Society of Jesus in 1624, became secretary to the Father-General in 1649, and died in Rome in 1676. F. Southwell had arranged D'Alegambe's papers, and had them ready for the press the year before his death. The Father-General Oliva and his assistants determined that much that had hitherto appeared in the bibliography of their order should be left out. The list of Jesuit-martyrs was cast aside. No mention was made of books which the Congregation of the Index had censured. No notice was taken of writers of minor works. Bulk was a qualification held needful for a writer to take his rank as an author. Thus cut down, Southwell's work appeared in Rome in 1676, under the title of "*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu.*" It contains the names of 2,240 Jesuit authors. In 1698, the Father-General Gonzalez de Santalla made great efforts to have F. Southwell's work continued. The only result was that F. Buonanni, rector of the Maronite College in Rome, a distinguished man of science, collected a good deal of matter, but it was never used and left to waste away on the shelves of a library. The succeeding Father-General made like efforts even with less results. Those on whom he called for help were not born bibliographers, for it seems that a bibliographer can no more be made than can a poet. Far more successful was the Father-General Retz. He confided the work of continuing the bibliography to F. Oudin. He was well versed in most of the languages of Europe, an elegant Latin poet, a man of much learning, and on occasion, a man of wit. Once an Atheist was boasting about his unbelief. F. Oudin scrutinized him with a look full of severity and disdain. "Father," asked the free-thinker, "why do you look at me in that fashion?" "I am looking at the beast called Atheism," quietly replied the Jesuit, "I never saw it until this moment." And the laugh of the company around overwhelmed the boastful beast. Oudin was a great lover of

books. His tastes were bibliographical. The Sixth General Congregation of the Society in 1730, by ordering the procurators of the different provinces of the order to send to Rome, every three years, a list of new works with notices of their authors, and the name and residence of their printers or publishers, greatly aided F. Oudin in his labours. He had got through the four first letters of the alphabet, under which were ranged 1,928 notices, while 700 others were ready for publication, when death overtook him in his 79th year. He was born in 1673, at Vignory, in Champagne. His work, so far as it went, was very methodical, sufficiently ample, and just in its judgments. He is sparing alike in his praise, and in his blame. He bestows them only where merited. Such is the opinion Michault expresses in his "Life of Oudin" (vide his "Mélanges Historiques et Philosophiques." Paris, 1754, vol. ii.). F. de Feller sums up the merits of Oudin's work, by saying that "this book, well executed, is sought after by all students of the history of literature." Oudin, in his declining years, chose F. Courtois to continue his labours. This he did, spending much time and his health in searching for materials for the work, until the suppression of the Jesuits in France and his ruined constitution put an end to his efforts. His death in 1772, prevented their renewal.

His papers fell into the hands of the celebrated F. Zaccaria, the friend of four Popes, a most devoted adherent to the Holy See, the successor of Muratori as librarian to the Duke of Modena, and the correspondent of nearly all the learned men of his time. Still, in spite of his vast erudition, the bibliography made little or no progress under his care. What little he may have done to it was stopped in its growth by the dissolution of the Society of Jesus. Thenceforth Zaccaria led the troubled life shared by all those known to regret their suppressed order. Cretineau-Joly, however, is wrong in supposing that this Father was imprisoned in the Castle of Saint Angelo. The friendship of Clement XIV. saved him from that trial. Dying in 1795, his papers passed into the possession of his heirs-at-law. The bibliography seemed doomed to incompleteness.

It was resumed, however, by F. Caballero, a native of Toledo, an ex-Jesuit resident in Rome. He commenced his literary researches as a distraction from the horrors of the revolution which he beheld desolating the Papal City in 1798. Whilst occupied in the libraries of Rome, he formed the design of continuing the bibliography of the Society. Another ex-Jesuit, F. Arevalo, the learned secretary of Cardinal Lorenzano, greatly aided Caballero in his task, and contrived

to get for him the manuscripts left by Zaccaria. Caballero got together 4,400 names of Jesuit writers. It was much, though the number in F. de Backer's three volumes, without taking into account the supplement, is eleven thousand. In 1814, Caballero, without means of his own to publish his work, went from one Roman publisher to another, in vain begging them to print his manuscripts. At last, tired of importuning the needy author's modern patrons, he was reduced to publishing some of the notices he had written on the later authors of the Society. They were arranged so as to form a series of supplements to F. Southwell's "*Bibliotheca*." Caballero, in his preface, relates in soul-stirring words all he had endured and was still enduring. The trials of that lonely ex-Jesuit were indeed severe. He was a man with a big heart. He loved his order as a child its mother. The mother he loved had been taken from him, and he felt himself an orphan. In his long solitary years of bereavement, he worked hard to place by his writings a memorial of her worth before men. Much was wanting that would have made his task not merely easier, but possible. The little regard that had been paid to the literary remains of the Society in its libraries had been so slight that a very large number of the catalogues of the different provinces of the Society had gone astray. Caballero, in vain, made many searches for them. Even the help he got from the manuscripts obtained by his friend was small, for they did not contain many of the very valuable notes Oudin and his successor must have bequeathed to posterity. It is sad to see, in face of so many obstacles, the brave-hearted Caballero, manfully and lovingly struggling on to the end, weighed down by the burden of seventy-six years, and maimed by accident, and so straightened by circumstances that he was forced to ask such correspondents as were good enough to point out any shortcomings in his work to do so "*missis litteris, sine meo tamen dispendio quod quidem ferendum non est in tantis pecuniæ angustiiis.*" It must have been a joy to this Father to have lived to read the decree of Pius VII. restoring the Society of Jesus in 1814. His manuscripts were deposited in the house of the Gesù at Rome. During the revolution of 1848, they disappeared.

It was out of the question for the restored Society, for many years to come, to trouble itself about its bibliography. More pressing wants had to be looked after first. Novices had to be formed, and, as we all know, a Jesuit is not made in a day. It was a long time before the number of Jesuits and the numbers of posts they had to fill were at all proportionate.

Until a very recent date, even in Belgium, perhaps the most thriving province of their order, one Jesuit had nearly always to do the work of two. In 1839, however, the twenty-second General Congregation of the Order charged the then newly-elected Father-General Roothaan to look after the continuing of the bibliography. Nothing immediately resulted, save that some partial attempts were made by members of the Order compiling bibliographies of their particular provinces. In this state were things when, one day turning over the pages of Southwell's book, the young Father de Backer was inspired to undertake the bibliography of the Society of Jesus.

Augustine de Backer was born at Antwerp on July 18th, 1809. His family held an honourable position in that great commercial city. His father was known and respected as a most upright citizen. No literary renown had as yet attached itself to the family. It was not, therefore, to perpetuate any literary traditions, nor with any thought of literary laurels, that the father sought to give his children a training that should fit them to fill their places in after life with honour to themselves and profit to their neighbours. He did not seek this training in colleges where education means merely an overdose of physical and mental instruction. He was old-fashioned enough to fancy, with a good number more of his fellow-citizens, that their sons would not get much good in such places, so he sent his sons to colleges where religion entered into the everyday life and studies of the scholars. Augustine, his second son, was, with his elder brother, first at the college of S. Nicholas, a small town, now rapidly rising in importance, south of Antwerp. Later on the two brothers went to the Beauregard College at Liège, and remained there until its suppression by the decree of the Dutch king in 1826. So general was the suppression of colleges at which a religious education was obtainable, that not a single one was left open in Belgium. This caused Augustine's father to seek for it abroad. He sent his son to S. Acheul, near Amiens. That college, opened in 1814 by the Jesuits, already counted its 800 students. Its work, however, was cut short by the fatal ordinances of Charles X., whom his ministry made the rival of the Dutch William in antagonism to religious education. The result of such a policy was fatal to both sovereigns. Both lost a kingdom by it, the first France, the second Belgium. Augustine, on the closing of the French college, returned home. It was intended that he should finish his studies by attending the classes of the governmental college in Antwerp. This was not allowed, for a law forbid those who had studied

abroad to enter any of the colleges or universities in the Low Countries. Consequently, he had once more to wander abroad to find religious education. He went to his former masters at Fribourg, in Switzerland. Having ended his studies there, he had a mind to enter the noviciate of the Jesuits. This though was not yet to be, and accordingly he returned home. His character at this period of his life is described as thoughtful, reserved, and taciturn. He shunned all unnecessary social intercourse, and he cared not for those pleasures in which youth usually seeks to recreate itself. Much of his time he gave to painting, in which he showed more than ordinary skill. Though he never developed the talent he had for the art, still some early drawings, carefully preserved by his family, show that it was not slight. In after life, too, he often evinced great knowledge of the art, though he so studiously avoided displaying his powers that even those who for years had lived in intimacy with him never knew that he himself had ever wielded the artist's brush to any purpose. One of his most familiar friends, at this early part of his life, was the great Belgian painter, Baron Wappers. At this same time, until 1834, he also turned his thoughts towards bibliography. He got together some choice Elzevirs. He also visited most of the libraries of Belgium, and thrice went to Paris, in search of matter for writing the history of the art of printing from its earliest stages.

Meanwhile, in 1830, when in Paris, he had seen the throne of Charles X. overturned, and he, twice a witness of the destruction of freedom for religious education, shared all the hopes for the renewal of that freedom looked forward to by French Catholics on the advent of Louis Philippe. In Belgium the struggle to cast off the yoke of Holland had begun. Since 1828 the Belgians had been busy drawing up petitions for the redress of their wrongs. Already Augustine had been one of the most active in getting signatures to these petitions. When then the young politician returned brimful of high hopes from what he had witnessed in Paris, he entered more warmly than ever into the patriotic struggle waged in his own country. Such was his warmth, that one day he gathered together on the quay beside the Scheldt a knot of the hardy sailors and stalwart porters of the Antwerp docks. To them, the young man usually so silent and reserved, poured forth in burning words the wrongs his fellow-countrymen had to bear. This daring sally brought down vengeance from the astonished authorities. A warrant was sent out to apprehend "M. de Backer, fils." The police went at once to find the audacious orator at the house of his father. The latter, looking at the

warrant, at once saw its shortcomings. Calling down his eldest son, he hinted to him what he was to do. The son at once showed himself to the police by whom he was quickly marched off to gaol, while his brother the patriot was hurrying off to Brussels. The clever Dutch magistrate, on examining his capture, found he had caught the wrong bird. Moreover, to his dismay, he found that there were three more brothers. Which "M. de Backer, fils," he wanted, was more than he could tell. He set to work to discover the culprit, but the rapid march of events soon made further search needless. On the 25th of October the people of Antwerp rose against their Dutch masters, and Augustine came back home to share in actively, and to watch anxiously, the troubles that then fell on the place of his birth. He wrote a narrative of the events he witnessed. Unfortunately, perhaps, the manuscript has been lost.

In 1834 his younger brother, Charles, joined the Jesuits. This revived in Augustine his old desire. After some consideration, without informing his family or friends of his ulterior intention, he set out in 1835 for Rome. Those who saw him depart imagined that he was bent on a mere bibliographical expedition. His mind was turned to a far higher aim. He had resolved to bid farewell

"To crowded halls, to court and street,
To frozen hearts and hasting feet,"

and to seek for admission to the noviciate of the Jesuits. Upon his arrival in Rome, he went at once to his fellow-countryman, the Father-General Roothaan. The latter, discerning the merits of the quiet young man, readily promised him admittance to the noviciate of the Belgian province of the Society. Leaving Rome, and on his way visiting several of the cities of northern Italy, Augustine proceeded down the Rhine and so regained his own land. Much of this journey he accomplished on foot. With the dust of the roads still fresh on his tourist's garb, he, on the Feast of S. Peter and Paul, 1835, knocked at the door of the Belgian noviciate of the Jesuits at Nivelles. No doubt, the good fathers, and still more his brother Charles among the novices were not a little surprised when the wayfarer declared his desire and produced a letter of recommendation from their Father-General. This insured his entry to the noviciate. It was not until he had exchanged his traveller's costume for the robes of a novice, that he informed his astonished family of his seeking to become a Jesuit. The two years of probation passed quickly away, and as smoothly as a time of trial can pass. Once only

during that time did he lose heart. He wrote home that he was about to return to it. With great heroism, his mother, stifling her natural feelings lest she should imperil her son's eternal welfare, replied that, though a place was always ready for him at the family hearth, he had better before he decided to occupy it, take time to consider his decision. During the few days his hesitation lasted, a holy Father died at the noviciate. Having seen how happy his end was, Augustine remembered the littleness and vanity of the world. "Expect me not," he at once wrote to his mother, "the charm is broken. My choice is made." He had sacrificed present joys for eternal ones to come; he was one more added to that great host, which for nearly nineteen hundred years has trodden the path of self-sacrifice in the service of the Church. When the noviceship was ended, he pronounced his solemn vows in the little chapel of the Jesuits at Nivelles. His heart was at ease. He was now a son of S. Ignatius. Usually the young Jesuit during two more years continues his literary studies, which, in the noviciate, are entirely broken off. It was not thought needful for Augustine to do this, so he was forthwith set to teach in a college until 1840, when he went to Louvain to study theology. There it was that he came upon F. Southwell's book, and the latent fire of his bibliographical love was kindled into fresh flames.

It was a hard work that on which Augustine de Backer was about to engage. It was one which twenty fathers of the Society of Jesus had attempted before him, and which none of them had succeeded in completing. The difficulties, too, of bringing it to a termination seemed, more than ever, hard to overcome. In the earlier days of the work the materials for it had been strewn far and wide, over every part of the habitable globe. For to what country has not the Jesuit been? If he has not, as some would have us think he has, been in every cabinet of Europe, he has at least been in every clime of the earth. And wherever he has been he has left behind him his books. Among the Indians of the Rocky Mountains; in the missions of Paraguay; in the heart of the Celestial Empire; among the realms of European civilization,—in Rome, the capital of Christendom; in Paris, under the Bourbons; in Madrid, when still the capital of an empire in which the sun never set; in Lutheran Germany; and in England, where to be a Jesuit was a capital crime, the Jesuit had been, scattering abroad his printed works, in many shapes and many tongues, until his labours were cut short by the suppression of his Society in the last century. That event made the toils of the bibliographer of the society a hundred-

fold harder, by scattering again his already scattered materials. No care was taken to keep together the libraries of houses of the Society after its suppression :—

“As a tree

That falls and disappears, the house is gone,
And, through improvidence or want of love
For ancient worth and honourable things,
The spear and shield are vanished.”

As an example of the fate that overtook most of these libraries we will briefly relate what befell those of the Society of Jesus in the Low Countries in the reign of that Tartar Khan, as Dom Pitra called him, the Emperor Joseph II. Most of the houses of the Jesuits in those countries contained large and often valuable libraries. The house of studies at Louvain had an especially fine one. That of the Bollandists was, however, by far the finest library in Belgium, and perhaps even, in its time, the best in Europe. At least such was the opinion of Henschenius and Papebroeck after they had seen most of the libraries of Europe and spent as many as nine months among those of Rome. Many, indeed, contained rarer and richer stores, but as a whole none were comparable to it. It was a wonder to Vossius, that Canon of Windsor whom Charles II. wittily described as believing in everything except the Bible. The royal donor of the Library of the Queen of Sweden, on her way to enrich the Vatican with her literary treasures, was filled with admiration on beholding the collection of the Bollandists. “It was situated,” says Dom Pitra (*“Études sur la Collection des Actes des Saints,”* pp. 51 to 60), “over the refectory of the house (of the Jesuits) at Antwerp, in a large room well aired and lighted. All round it were desks breast high, and above separate cases for each month of the year, in which each day had its distinct place reserved for detached documents and manuscripts. The remainder of the room was furnished with shelves for books and for large manuscripts, arranged as follow: general history, the histories of particular bishoprics, abbeys, and various ecclesiastical institutions; next, general lives of saints, monographs, Proper Offices, Breviaries, and other liturgical works.

There were to be found from ten to twelve hundred Acts of the Saints, which Henschenius and Papebroeck had brought from Italy, and the 267 unpublished Acts relating to the Eastern Church, preserved, as Papebroeck avers, in their original text. Judging from the 91 volumes remaining for the three last months of the “Acta,” there must have been for the whole year nearly 400 volumes and portfolios. There were

more than 8,000 printed works, of which the choiceness, rareness, and character, enhanced their worth. Papebroeck remarks that, in his time, the library had, in Italian alone, 400 different lives of Saints and 200 histories of towns, bishoprics, and convents in Italy. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the value of this literary storehouse was doubled by the Bellarmine Museum, which a Chancellor of Brabant, de Gryspere, had, in the preceding century, founded and richly endowed. Humbert de Précipiano, Archbishop of Mechlin, increased the endowment to sixteen thousand florins, and enriched the museum with many manuscripts and a great collection of printed works."

All these priceless treasures were ruthlessly to be cast abroad. In the autumn of 1773 two decrees were issued ordering the sale of all the property belonging to the then lately-suppressed Society in the Netherlands. Consequently, most of the valuable collection at Antwerp was sold by public auction, and became the property of strangers. However, 53,000 volumes were saved for the Royal Library at Brussels. The sale of books belonging to the libraries of the Jesuits in Belgium lasted sixteen days and yielded over 132,084 florins. Their list fills seven large catalogues, without mention of those taken for the Royal Library. Probably over two hundred thousand volumes were sold. The Bollandists were allowed to keep eight thousand printed volumes and four hundred manuscripts for the use of their work. In 1788 these, on the dispersion of the Bollandists, were sold, most fortunately, to the Abbot of Tongerlo. "Tongerloo," says Dom Pitra (Pitra, *op. cit.*, p. 105), "was the ark of safety God chose to shelter the Acts of the Saints; and when emperors, kings, and philosophers had extended their persecutions even to it, in place of monks, the last guardians to be dispersed, He found some farm labourers and villagers, unlettered and poor, to shelter under the roofs of their cottages those treasures driven hither and thither . . . All honour to those peasants of Tongerlo, who, for more than twenty years, unheeded by all the world, kept guard day and night over those stacks of Greek and Latin manuscripts." The books reserved for the Royal Library were stored in the church of the ex-Jesuits at Brussels. There they were plundered by the librarian of the university of Louvain and by others who were not far wrong in thinking they had as good a right to the books as had those who had robbed the Jesuits of them. Many books also were lost by frequent removes, and made their way into the old clothes-shops. At last, what remained found, in 1792, a resting-place in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. The

story of the scattering of the Jesuits' libraries elsewhere than in the Netherlands no doubt is analogous to the one we have told. Perhaps, the hatred of false philosophers and of statesmen for the Jesuits and the vandalism of the Revolution have done more ill-service to the republic of letters than any events since the inroads of barbarism on the decline of the Roman empire. Anyhow they cast such difficulties in the way of a bibliographer of the Society of Jesus, that most men would have halted in dismay at the very outset. Augustine de Backer was not to be daunted, for he entered on his labours as one inspired to do them. "I yielded," he wrote afterwards, "to an inspiration, of which God alone knows the secret. I thought I could shut my ears to perchance too-well-founded hints, sufficiently disheartening, as to my powerlessness, and follow only the current of my zeal and love for the Society."

It is a most marvellous thing how he did all he has done, when we find how little time his duties as a religious and a priest allowed him to give to literary labours. Ordained priest, in 1843, at Liège, he did not end his theological studies at Louvain till the following year. He then had to undertake the duties of two important posts at the College of S. Servais, in the former town. Both posts were so onerous that, except from special causes, as in the present instance from short-handedness, they are ones usually confided to different persons. One of the posts he was enabled, however, to give up in 1847. Though he never neglected in the least the studies he was ordered to follow, or the duties he had to look after, he, nevertheless, managed before 1850 to fill nearly four quarto volumes, each of them over 800 pages, with notes for his bibliography. In that year his younger brother Aloïs, who had also become a Jesuit, was named by his superiors to assist his brother in his bibliography. Soon after the two brothers started off, the younger for Rome, the elder to France, in search of fresh materials. The younger found in Rome a worthy old Jesuit father, by name Beorchia, who had expended much labour in getting together matter for a volume on the bibliography of his order in Italy. Hearing of the projects of the two Belgian fathers, his love for his own literary offspring was wounded to the quick, and with a natural jealousy, pardonable in any author, and more especially in one weighed down with years, he hid his manuscripts and would not let his young rival see them. Soon after the good old Father went to his rest for ever. The heads of the house at the Gesù, where he died, offered his manuscripts, on certain rigorous conditions, to F. de Backer. The latter examined the manuscripts, and alas!

those objects of such tender affection were found to be of no real value. What a lesson for us all, to teach us what poor judges we are of the worth of our own writings! F. de Backer, laden with spoils gotten by much labour from many French libraries, returned to Liège to meet his brother, who had brought back no less 5,000 bibliographical notices, many new and of much worth. Remembering the fate of too many MSS. left by former bibliographers, it was resolved to print serially the materials as they were garnered in from various quarters. Accordingly, on October 1st, 1853, appeared the first series of the "*Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*," published at Liège by Grandmont-Donders. It bore on the title-page the names of the two brothers, the Fathers de Backer. It was described as containing bibliographical notices of all works published by Jesuits since the foundation of their order down to the present time, as also of all apologies and controversies to which such works had given rise. The work appeared at intervals; its last and seventh series coming out in 1861. Between the publication of each series F. Augustine undertook a journey in search of new matter. In 1854 he visited Germany, whence he had to return, being taken ill from overwork. He went to Italy in 1855, to Austria in 1857, to Spain in 1859, and later on to Holland.

The publication of the first series was a signal for the critics to commence firing on the work. One, addicted to figurative language, described it as a "cemetery" wherein the Jesuits had buried their dead works. The word became a standing joke against F. de Backer. His brethren often playfully teased him about it. One who had shown him a cartulary he was editing, expressed a hope that it might secure him a place in the "cemetery." "Certainly, and an epitaph also," was the reply. "What one?" asked the aspirant after funereal honours. "He passed his life à dénicher les cryptogames de l'histoire." The opinions in regard to the work expressed by Julius Petzhold should be recorded:—"The '*Bibliothèque de la Compagnie*' is a giant's work, but the first series of it just now published shows that those who have undertaken it have shoulders made to bear its burden."* And on the entire series he passes the following judgment:—"The attempts to write the bibliography of the Jesuits, made by the learned Fathers Ribadeneira, d'Alegambe, and Southwell have been looked upon as the outcome of marvellous researches, and as the fruit of a science very great in regard to the ages in which

* "*Anzeiger für Bibliographie und Bibliothekwissenschaft*," Halle, 1855, p. 13.

they lived. Still no comparison can be drawn between their works and that of F. de Backer. The almost infinite number of writings with which the disciples of S. Ignatius have enriched every branch of human knowledge, gives his work greater usefulness and merit. The Fathers de Backer were not satisfied with just bringing together the materials furnished by their predecessors. They have added to them, and have brought them up to the requirements of modern bibliography. They have stopped up every gap. All that has been until now published regarding the bibliography of the Jesuits, has become superfluous since the appearance of this work. We can now learn for ourselves what has been the literary and scientific activity of the Jesuits down to the present day. But, it is clear, that whatever may be our opinion as to the aims of their order, we must admit that its members take their place amongst the most enlightened and laborious pioneers of science. Therefore the work of the Fathers de Backer is an impartial, energetic, and triumphant apology of their Order.* We should add no force to what we have said by quoting from the chorus of praises sung by minor critics in honour of the work. The judgment of the great German bibliographer is enough.

It might naturally be supposed that on the publication of the last of the series of his great work, F. de Backer would have taken a little rest, at least in his bibliographical labours. Not so. He only changed their direction and published a contribution to the design of his youth—a history of early printing. It appeared under the title of "*Annales Plantiniennes*," in 1855, and was the joint production of himself and the learned librarian of the Royal Library at Brussels, M. Ch. Ruelens. In the beginning of the preceeding year Father de Backer published a bibliographical essay on the "*Imitation of Christ*." The number of editions of that most famous book, mentioned in the essay, is 3,300. There exists in MS. a second edition of the essay, which, it is hoped, F. de Backer's brother will print, which contains mention of nearly thrice as many editions!

New materials, meanwhile, flowing in for the great work of F. de Backer, it was resolved to issue a new edition of it. A new fellow-worker was given to the Fathers de Backer in the person of F. Carlos Sommervogel, who brought with him much valuable and fresh material from Champagne, the province to which he belonged. The first volume of the new edition came out in 1869, the second in 1872, and the third volume was being made ready for the press when F. Augustine's death left

* J Petzholdt, "*Bibliotheca Bibliographica*," p. 164.

the completion of it in the hands of his brother. The shape chosen for the new edition was the folio size, each page divided into three columns of close print. The first volume of 784 pages, comprised writers whose names fell alphabetically under the letters from A to H, and contained over four thousand two hundred notices. The second volume, with 738 pages, got as far as R, and contained over three thousand six hundred and fifty bibliographical notices. The order followed in arranging the matter was, firstly, the name of the author; then a historical account, made as short as possible of him; then the books he published placed in the order of time in which they were given to the public. After each work mention is made of the number of editions it has gone through; translations of it that have been made, with the translator's name; and the polemical or other works to which it has given rise. After the distinct works of an author, comes a list of articles he may have contributed to periodicals and journals; of any manuscripts he may have left; and a list of lives written of the author. The number of lives of S. Aloysius is so great that the list of them fills eleven columns of the work. In cases where an author has left the Society, the works he published after his leaving are not mentioned. An exception was made to this rule in favour of Mark Anthony de Dominis, whose bibliography had never been carefully treated elsewhere. The names of living authors are classed in a supplement, which brings the work down to the year 1873. We do not mean to repeat what various published reviews of this new edition have said in its praise, nor what they have said against it, for this we cannot do, for their "unanimity was wonderful" in passing favourable judgments on it. We should much like to know what men of learning said of it in their private letters. No doubt F. de Backer got many such, for his correspondence was necessarily very extensive. His modesty would not allow him to speak to others of the contents of such letters, and they have not survived him, for he always destroyed them unless they contained some bibliographical detail worthy of insertion in his work. A letter, kept on this account, exists written by Montfalcon, the learned librarian of Lyons, containing this remarkable passage:—"You are one of the chosen workers of an order for which I have ever had the highest esteem." Doubtless many more such honourable testimonials were amongst the letters F. de Backer received, but he carefully concealed them. The burden of his correspondence must have been great, though he never complained of it, and used it as a change to obtain rest when wearied by other labours. Numberless were the authors who applied to the father when,

in the course of their work, they chanced upon a Jesuit about whom they desired information. He never refused what aid he could, and gave it to all with a winning generosity.

F. de Backer was a true lover of books. He had all a bibliophilist's affection for them. His biographer* tells us that the father came to him one day with the preface to his volumes. He asked him to look over it to see if he had over-valued the worth of his own work or those of the Society. The humble tone of the preface tells us what was, of course, the future biographer's reply. The latter, however, objected to one word in it—the word "sublime" applied to the invention of printing.

F. de Backer (says his biographer†) received my remark with a slightly sarcastic smile, and said, "Oh, these young men! but think a little! see how printing has stirred up the world; see what it has done, what we have been able to do with it! What should we have been without it? What should we have done without it? We should have been good old monks, bent on transcribing, with pen and pencil, manuscripts afterwards to be left enchained to the shelves of our libraries. Man's intellect has done in a century with printing what it could not have done in twenty without it." . . . Then he recalled to my recollection those great Catholic works which printing alone made possible, those collections of Fathers of the Church, of Councils, of Bulls, placing in the hands of even the poorest of country parish priests those great works of religious controversy, and so forth. . . . "Therefore I maintain that the invention of printing was a 'sublime' invention." I capitulated, and the word "sublime" was allowed to remain. Never did I see him so animated, so talkative, nay more, even so eloquent. But had I not struck a tender chord? I had slighted printing before this bibliographer, whose life was spent in connection with it, who had handled thousands of books, who had traced, in books, the march of the human intellect during well-nigh three centuries, who, by the help of printing, had seen the long line of our writers pass in review, of whom he could say, "Wherever a Jesuit had trodden, wherever a house of the order had been founded, or a college, or mission, there arose new apostles labouring, teaching, writing. They did not always produce works of genius, nor even of talent, though always their works at least were destined to do good."

A recent French author, one whose wits far exceeded his wisdom, has left behind him a spirited sketch of a bibliophilist. He describes him as a hale and hearty old man, of firm erect gait, with clothes well-brushed issuing forth from

* In the pleasant and instructive work which has been the text-book of this paper, F. van Tricht gives us not only an introduction to the Jesuit bibliographer and his books, but adds much valuable information in the appendix, especially in regard to the astronomical labours of the Jesuits prior to their dissolution in the last century.

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 120, 121.

his house in the morning, and coming home of an evening, a changed man, weary and dusty, not with travel but with much searching in the shops of the sellers of old books. Speak to him of Elzevirs and Aldines, of bindings by Derome and Thouvenin, find him a copy of some rare work whose title-page is a little less soiled than the one of the copy he has in his small and select library, and no man is happier. Tell him that a book for which, perhaps, he has been looking for years, is on sale by auction at such a place, and his gratitude knows no bounds. The hours to him seem to have no wings until the time for the auction arrives. He is the first to reach the sale-room. He is in a fever of anxiety while the bidding goes on for the coveted volume, until the thud of a hammer dooms the work to be his. What joys, unknown to most earthly mortals, fill his breast as he bears away his prize! He dines, and it is beside him—his only and honoured guest. In the evening, he arranges his books, gloating over each dear volume, but the place of honour on his shelves is given to the new comer. Happy passion that can make a man so contented. For him

"Small sands the mountain, moments make the year,
And trifles life."

And with his trifles he glides through life, until death parts him for ever from his books. His time has been spent, if not in doing harm, at least in doing little good. F. de Backer had no such useless mania for books. He gauged them at their true worth, that is, by measuring the good or evil they had done or could do. He saw how much the Society, of which he was a member, had done through books, and he loved those books, not for their rarity or their fine type, or thick paper, or gorgeous binding, but for the good they had done. He therefore laboured strenuously to erect a useful monument to their memory. Therein he showed himself a rational bibliophilist.

We have already seen how great an amount of work he got through while filling important posts at the college in Liège. Later on, from 1854, we find him described as *confessarius et scriptor* in the Catalogues of Jesuits belonging to the Belgian province. It is wonderful how even as such he found means to get through heavy bibliographical labours. For, rising at four o'clock, a visit to the Blessed Sacrament, an hour's meditation, saying holy Mass and thanksgiving, breakfast and a walk in the playground of the college, made it close upon seven o'clock before he could begin work in his room. He then had over four hours wherein to labour, but they were

hours broken by many interruptions. He was a much sought-after confessor, and during those hours repeated calls were made for him in the confessional. He was so often asked for advice in so many other ways, that all the morning he had a constant stream of visitors in the little receiving-parlour of the college. His help was especially sought in bringing about reconciliations in families. Many a family now enjoying a holy peace owes it to F. de Backer. Later on, his doctor found it necessary to forbid him to receive his visitors and penitents in any number, and the lay-brother who acted as doorkeeper was ordered on no account even to inform the father of persons wanting to see him. Once, some young men tried in vain, with all the eloquence they could command, to overcome the sturdy porter's refusal to tell the father he was wanted. Another father, chancing to have passed their way, with mistaken good-nature bore the young men's message to F. de Backer. "I will see them this once" was the latter's mild reply, "but please remember another time that the doctor wishes me to see nobody during these hours." And he hurried down to the importunate young men. The broken hours of morning study over, all too soon, examination of conscience and dinner followed, and, to this, recreation. None, says his biographer, save those who shared them, can tell what the good father was at these hours of relaxation. When the place he filled in that family circle—for community life is the true family life in religion—was vacant for ever by his death, those who had known him there would often regretfully exclaim, "Ah! would that he were still here!" Perhaps one of the chief charms of his conversation in those few minutes of recreation arose from his dislike to arguments. Never when necessary did he flinch from firmly and strenuously upholding truth, but on subjects of indifferent kind, however right he felt himself to be, and however foolish his antagonist might be, if the latter held on tenaciously to his opinions, rather than prolong the contest, F. de Backer preferred to be silent, satisfying himself with a dissenting shrug of the shoulders and a slight smile. That shrug and smile were often more effective than any words. "You argued well," he once remarked to a young religious, who had begged him to point out any faults he might note in him, "you argued well, though of what use was it?" "Oh! I had such good reasons" was the reply, "I felt sure I was right." "And so thought your opponent," rejoined the father; "besides, if you have a right to make another think your way, others have a right to make you think their ways. Suppose all joined in forcing you to hold their views?" Another cause also made

his conversation so pleasant. His talk was always "good talk," because it was never egotistical. He had, of course, read much, and men who have read much are often prone to talk much about what they have read. He had also travelled much, and he was a keen observer, and could at need recount many facts of great interest he had noted when abroad. Yet such was his humility and dislike to thrust himself forward in the least, that one who had lived for nine years under the same roof with him, said: "He never spoke to me of his books or travels." He was of a very frank disposition, and naturally of rather a hasty temper. This temper he had learned to keep under, and it never showed itself, except when a person displayed a crafty, shuffling, deceitful disposition. Then all the fierceness and impetuosity of his nature, such as marked the ardent young patriot of Antwerp, blazed forth. Of a faith, it was most righteously kindled.

His love for youth was great, and showed itself by encouraging young men to take up each one some special study. His advice was that which we well remember receiving at school. "Have a hobby," said a good Jesuit father to us boys, "and ride it to death." "Choose some study," said F. de Backer, "make it the centre around which all your works revolve, so that when your duties allow you a little leisure your mind at once returns to it, and no time is lost in concentrating your thoughts on it." This was what he himself did, and this was the secret of his being able, amid so many distractions, to perform such vast labours. He sought always to aid young students in riding their "hobby" to death. A student of science, a Jesuit, who lived with F. de Backer, related that never did a review or journal come to the college without the father opening it at the part headed "Science," and if there was mention of any new scientific publication, he forthwith offered to get it for the student. His thoughtfulness for others made the bibliographer so beloved.

We have certainly lingered too long over the time of recreation, longer than F. de Backer would have seen good to allow us. For, no sooner was the time allotted to recreation over than he took his daily walk, a strictly constitutional one, always over the same path, varied only now and again by being taken in a contrary direction, or very often by visits to sick persons. Of these he never wearied. Even shortly before his death, when his heart was deeply diseased, his doctor met him mounting a steep hill leading to a poor quarter of Liège. "What are you so foolishly doing up this way?" bluntly asked the doctor. "Ah! my dear doctor," was the answer, "why do you not ask what my poor sick are

doing there so high up?" F. de Backer loved souls too tenderly to fear risking his health and his life in serving them. He was what Lacordaire said a priest should be, as tender as a mother and as hard as a diamond; but his tenderness was for others, his hardness for himself, though even in his tenderness he knew when it was good to seem harsh to others. "He led me along very roughly," said one of his penitents, "but I felt that it was for my good, and even in his harshness I discovered his affection for me." Visits of mere civility were always disagreeable to him. Except when forced, he kept to the very letter of the rule of his Order which forbids them. To his great delight a gentleman got F. de Backer to pay him a visit. The gentleman had found a small printed book, the work of a Jesuit, which the bibliographer had not seen. "If F. de Backer wants to see it, he must come to my house for it," said the pleased finder, "and so I shall at last have a visit from him." His walk over, the Father returned to his room to pursue his studies until half-past six. Then it was his constant custom to kneel down to recite the Rosary. The ordinary routine of a Jesuit's life filled up his time until nine o'clock, the hour for retiring to rest. By special leave, he was allowed to curtail the seven hours allowed for sleep, and to continue his work until eleven o'clock.

With his great bibliographical volumes before us,—those volumes which will bear his name down through ages to come,—it is hardly needful to say that he was a hard and incessant worker. His advice to young students, the hours he himself gave to study, to works of charity, and to labouring for souls, show he was emphatically a worker. He never tired of working. A change of labours he thought rest enough. It was not. For overwork hastened his end, if it did not actually kill him. He had the spirit of Ozanam, that martyr to noble labours, who said so eloquently:—

Every day, our friends and our brothers find death as soldiers or as missionaries, on the shores of Africa, or before the palaces of Mandarins. Meanwhile what do we? Do you think that God wishes some to die in the service of civilization and of the Church, and has given to others the task of living with their arms folded, resting on a bed of roses? No! gentlemen, workers in science, Christian men of letters, let us prove that we are not base enough to believe in an arrangement which it would be an insult to accuse God of having made, and a disgrace for us to allow. Let us be ready to show that we also have our battle-fields, on which too death is to be found.

That death Father de Backer found. He was correcting the proofs of the last edition of his work. They were still on his

desk beside him when, on the morning of December 1st, 1873, the doctor came to visit him. The previous evening he had complained of feeling rather worse than usual, but no immediate danger was feared. In the morning he had taken a longer rest than was his wont. "Well, Father de Backer," exclaimed the doctor, entering the room; but the question was broken off. A glance at the calm, placid features of the Father as he lay on his bed, his arms folded cross-wise on his breast, and the stillness of the room, of which

Even the motion of an angel's wing
Would interrupt the intense tranquillity,

showed that the labourer was taking his last long rest. The good people of Liège came in crowds to the mortuary chapel where his body awaited burial. His features were unchanged by "death's effacing fingers." There was still that calm, frank face, that forehead furrowed by the mind's activity, that look that inspired respect, and those long silver locks that ever commanded veneration. It all seemed so unlike death. His brethren and friends could not believe him to be dead. They were right. He was asleep in the Lord.

ART. VIII.—THE WAR.

Protocol relative to the Affairs of Turkey. Signed at London March 31, 1877. London : printed by Harrison & Sons.

THE war, which has already begun, is, our readers are well aware, no matter of surprise to us. While stocks have risen and fallen, newspaper telegrams told their daily tale of contradiction, ministers and ambassadors pretended to trust each other, and to be animated with one unanimous longing for Peace, during the balmy and halcyon days of the Conference; and even when the very bridge of honourable retreat and complete reconciliation, the Protocol itself was being composed, that foreboding which we have again and again expressed within the last six months, never escaped from our mind. The elements now in conflict, not merely in the East of Europe, but throughout its entire extent, are such as have never in the history of man been dispersed or resolved into other forms without war, long, exhausting, and general. Every power in Europe has been preparing for such a war for the space of a generation, at a cost ruinous to the finances of the weaker States, and very oppressive to even the strongest; and though it is now the craze of the day to believe that the conflict will be "localized," not merely the preparations of the Powers, but their very declarations, show that the phrase represents what is neither expected nor intended. They have all declared, that although they will not interfere to prevent war, they will watch the war with a keen regard to their own interests; and it is plain that all their interests are almost immediately involved. The interests of both Prussian and Austrian Germany are involved whenever a Russian army occupies the valley of the Danube. The interests of England are involved whenever a Russian fleet passes Malta on its way towards the Dardanelles; and if the disaffection of the crews of the Turkish navy be such as is alleged, danger may be any day imminent at the very Porte. France is not unconcerned in whatever affects the destinies of the Latin Christians of the East; and, to take a more mundane view of her policy, is hardly capable of resisting the temptation of any circumstances, which may engage, against another enemy, any detachment even of the forces of Prussia. Italy is already advertised as the bravo of Russia, and King Victor Emmanuel's early foreboding, that he was destined to die a colonel of

Cossacks, seems to be in a fair way to fulfilment. There are everywhere the omens of a war such as that of which Dr. Sharp wrote to James I. 250 years ago, with, as he confesses, "a little change of the excellent poet's words:"—

Quis non Europeo sanguine pinguior
 Campus sepulchris impia praelia
 Testatur ? Auditumque Turcis
 Europæe sonitum ruinae ?
 Qui gurgēs aut quæ flumina lugubris
 Ignara belli ! Quo mare civicae
 Non decoloravere cædes ?
 Quæ caret ora cruore nostro ?

The condition of public opinion in England at present almost compels the belief that the state of invincible ignorance has extended from the province of theology into that of politics. All the old regard for public law, for the sanctity of treaties, for national honour, and the traditions of state-policy seem to have vanished from the minds of the greater part of the people who take an interest in politics, the large class who may be described as originators and artists of opinion, as well as, most unfortunately, from the great body of our statesmen. That Mr. Gladstone should have degenerated into a mere agitator and pamphleteer is bad enough ; but it is not the worst. We have got a Foreign Minister who declares in Parliament that treaties become obsolete whenever it is found to be inconvenient to fulfil their obligations, and who signs a protocol which in its every line repudiates solemn treaty stipulations and principles of public right, with the reserve that unless it produces immediately its intended effect,—the conclusion of peace between Czar and Sultan, the principles of both the Treaty of Paris and of this Protocol are to be regarded as alike discarded and exploded. Time was when an English minister would have known how to ascertain and assure himself before he signed such a document whether it had adequate sanction for the execution of all its conditions. Time was when the minister who refused to sign such a document, avowing promptly that he regarded it as a mere trick of diplomatic legerdemain, would have been sure of the support of Crown, Parliament, and people. But there is apparently a fault in the structure of Lord Derby's mind which disables him from realizing the great moral obligation which attaches to the higher class of state papers, and leads him to try and minimize their meaning with a pitiful pettifoggery as soon as the obligation he has undertaken appears to be at all inconvenient. Just ten years ago we had an ugly specimen of this brain-fault in the guarantee of the Luxem-

burg treaty, when, after Mr. Disraeli had declared that of all the immortal deeds of the house of Stanley, the way in which his noble friend had secured the peace of Europe by that particular treaty was about the most sempiternal, Lord Derby rose and said that the guarantee in reality guaranteed nothing and obliged nobody. Statesmanship of this sort might be reckoned smart on the other side of the Atlantic, and no doubt is entirely approved by such Ministers as General Ignatieff and Prince Bismarck, especially when they have the satisfaction of turning it to their own advantage. But it is not by such statesmanship that England became a great empire; and it is by such statesmanship that the public spirit of great nations is demoralized and enfeebled.

Meantime the war has begun. That hostilities should have commenced without a declaration of war, with the invasion of the capital of Roumania by a Russian regiment, is in perfect consistency with the insolent audacity and bad faith which has characterized the Czar's policy throughout all these transactions. It is now more than ten years since Lord Palmerston wrote a letter openly accusing the Russian Government of sending arms into, and stimulating insurrection in, Bulgaria. The movement which culminated amid such horrors last autumn was so long ago set on foot under Russian authority, directed by Russian agents, sustained by Russian funds, and was already on the point of exploding when the contest between France and Germany commenced in 1870. In 1867 a Turkish statesman, Ziya Bey, then in exile, published a letter, circulated through the press of Europe, in which he uttered these among other words that have been exactly verified since :—

Always true to her ambitious traditions, Russia follows up her scheme of aggrandisement with unremitting zeal. Daily she instils poison into the veins of our body politic. With her numerous agents, whose action is directed by her ambassador at Constantinople, she avails herself of every opportunity to turn it to her own account. She makes both Europe and the Porte play into her hands. She stations troops on our frontiers, endeavours to beget revolution openly at Crete and secretly in Bulgaria; and is now pitting Servia against us, supplying her with the means of creating a disturbance. She sides with Greece, is on the alert in Thessaly and Epirus, and gives us trouble in Chios, Samos, Montenegro, and the Danubian Principalities.

In another paragraph of the same memorable letter, Ziya Bey exactly predicted what would happen if his country were to continue thus abandoned to Russian intrigue—what would happen, and what it seems is now about to happen :—

For this result, he said, Russia is waiting, having long undermined the country by her indirect and unlawful influence. Civil war once broken out,

Russia will take the field, will meet the armies of the West on Turkish soil, and make all the provinces of the Ottoman Empire the theatre of a terrible struggle which may end in the fall of a State of 36,000,000 people. Unless speedily amended, such will be the consequence of the improvident policy adopted by the Western Cabinets.

But how, it may be asked, did Russia, having already brought affairs so near a crisis, suddenly stop the great Pan-Slavonic movement of 1867-70? Public opinion was intensely occupied with it during those years, and then at once forgot all about it. There is no better proof how entirely artificial it was. From the moment the Franco-German war commenced, the Russian Government saw that a greater advantage was to be taken from the repudiation of the clause of the Treaty of Paris affecting their position in the Black Sea. Accordingly, in an instant the Bulgarians were abandoned to their peaceful pursuits, and the great Pan-Slavonic idea laid by. "There is one thing," wrote the Duke of Wellington to Lord Aberdeen in somewhat similar circumstances, "which delights me in all this, and that is, the proof afforded every day of that which I told Mr. Canning in 1826; viz., that the Russian Emperor did not care one pin about the Greeks, and that all he cared about was, his affairs with the Turks, and these very points Anapa and Poti." So the report was officiously spread on the very eve of the crossing of the Pruth, that if Turkey would make some further concessions of Asiatic territory, and especially surrender the port of Batoum, the Czar would immediately make peace, and be quite content with the Sultan's promise as to his treatment of his Christian subjects. It is not an ill omen for the Turks that they have opened their Asiatic campaign by inflicting a sharp repulse upon the Czar's troops near Batoum. Whenever peace is made,—and the day is distant we fear,—it will be found, as heretofore, that the soil of Turkey, not the souls of its people, is the *primum mobile* of Russian armies.

There is in this case every sign that usually attends the commencement of a long and complicated and most sanguinary war. The mere distances to be traversed and extent of conterminous frontiers are such as can be found in no other European States. The ancient hatred between the two nations, in which all the passions of dominion, race, and religion are engaged, tend to make the conflict implacable and desperate. The military power of Russia, in comparison with that of Turkey, is perhaps as great as that of the Northern States was in comparison with that of the Southern States during the American war. But Russia cannot afford to employ her

whole military power with the same absolute unity of purpose with which the Washington Government directed its vast armies to surround and crush the South during a war on a somewhat similar scale. There may be insurrection in Poland, or in Khiva. Prince Gortchakow can hardly hope that this affair will end without some other Power besides Turkey stepping into the field; and to be prepared for emergencies, there must be strong armies held in reserve. The army which Turkey will be able to array on the Danube may therefore not be unequal in numbers to that which is advancing to attack it. It has great advantages of position. It is composed of undeniably brave and fairly disciplined soldiers. It is sustained by powerful fortresses. Its armament is probably not inferior to that of the Russian army. Whether either side possesses a great commander remains to be tested. But that Turkey will not want competent military advisers, and that she is capable of making a prolonged and terrible resistance, we see no reason to doubt. If it cost Russia 300,000 men to advance to Adrianople against a very ineffective defence fifty years ago, it is not likely to cost her a man less to-day. The slaughter is sure to be terrible in hosts armed with the new weapons, but hardly accomplished in the new drill, whose fanaticism is a large part of their valour, and who will accordingly be led with little regard for the economy of life which would mark German or French strategy.

But that Russia may, and even in all probability will reach, not merely Adrianople, but Constantinople, we do not dream of denying. Sooner, perhaps, but certainly then, she will find herself engaged in a war to which that now beginning is but as a flash in the pan,—a war in which she will either be utterly ruined and disrupted or will attain a position, like in its vast and irresistible majesty to that of the Rome of Augustus. "*Votre vieille Europe m'ennuit*" said Napoleon. The Europe of to-day would perhaps present a more hopeful aspect to the great captain's eye. It contains not less than eight million of men under arms. It is spending at the rate of not much less than a hundred and fifty millions sterling a year on preparations for war. The instruments of war have been carried to a degree of precision and destructiveness which can hardly be surpassed. In fine, all the great military powers are in a state of continual unrest, mutual distrust, arming, fortifying, enlisting against each other, utterly regardless of treaty obligations, continually covetous of new frontiers. How long will the truce between France and Germany last? Ask Marshal von Moltke. What the elements at work in the policy of Germany may be, we do not

pretend to guess; but the precipitate yet ostentatious retirement of the great Chancellor, and the sudden burst of candid eloquence lately uttered by the systematically silent Chief of the Staff, both in their way give reason for reflection. Will Prussia support Russia now, as Russia once, and more than once, supported Prussia? The signs seem to point in that direction, and beyond it, to an imminent combination of the military force of Russia, Germany, and Italy. Such a combination might ruin the Austrian Empire immediately, the British Empire eventually; and if the quality of our statesmanship is not improved in some now quite unforeseen way, at no very distant date. Our statesmen now only seem to see what is under their noses, only know what is printed in the penny papers, and snatch at any policy that is likely to please for twenty-four hours the mob in the street.

It happened seven years ago, that, on the eve of that war which will be regarded by the future historian as only the prelude of the one now beginning, an august decree was uttered at Rome, against which it was declared by the noisy wiseacres of the world, that the intellect and conscience of civilized mankind would rise in universal revolt. Civilized mankind had no more thought of such a folly than it had of attempting the rebuilding of Babel. There was a little, very little, very silly clamour; and the truth shone on until it enlightened the whole world. Even now it is the merest matter of fact to say that the voice of the Papacy was never listened to with more loyal submission within the Church, with more sincere respect by those who deny its divine authority. In proof, take the way in which the recent Allocation of his Holiness was received and discussed by almost the entire Press of this country. Directed only against the bad faith and lawless ambition of the Italian Government, that Allocation yet contained an exact impeachment of the causes which have brought almost all modern governments to the same evil pass,—menaced with Revolution from within, drifting from armed peace into inconclusive war, enemies and oppressors of the Church of God. The old Europe, which bored Napoleon, has been gradually accumulating combustibles enough for such a conflagration as even its battle-scarred plains have never hitherto witnessed. If it must be so, let us hope and pray that a new Christendom may rise from its ashes.

ART. IX.—AN EXAMINATION OF MR. HERBERT
SPENCER'S "PSYCHOLOGY."—PART IV.

CHAPTER VII.—REASON.

THE contents of this chapter may be summarized as follows:
—§ 203. There is no hiatus between the lowest and the highest psychical states. § 204. Reason is a confusion of nascent motor excitations. § 205. Inference is association. § 206. The absence of a hiatus is made clear by the infant. § 207. The law of psychical cohesion serves to explain the highest mental phenomena, (§ 208) while the addition of heredity reconciles the experiential and *a priori* hypotheses.

Here, in this chapter on reason, we come to the climax, perhaps, of what I must venture to call the *unreason* of Mr. H. Spencer! First (p. 453) he re-asserts the gradual evolution of the highest psychical powers from the lowest, and denies a *hiatus* between instinct and reason. He says truly that its non-existence is implied in the last few chapters and by his General Synthesis. But though it is involved in *his* teaching, the fact that there is such a "continuous adjustment of inner to outer relations progresses in space, in time, in speciality, in generality, and in complexity," by no means involves such a negation of hiatus. Neither does the fact "that the growth of intelligence is throughout determined by the repetition of experiences" involve it either.

And next we have a most singular example of both a striking absence of perception of difference and of a manifest begging of the question in one and the same passage. He ventures to assert as follows:—"The impossibility of establishing any line of demarcation between the two (reason and instinct) may be *clearly demonstrated*. If every instinctive action is an adjustment of inner relations to outer relations, and if every rational action is also an adjustment of inner relations to outer relations; then, any alleged distinction can have no other basis than some difference in the character of the relations to which the adjustments are made. It **MUST BE** that while, in instinct, the correspondence is between inner and outer relations that are very simple or general, in reason the correspondence is between inner and outer relations that are complex, or special, or abstract, or infrequent." But

why may not the difference be in the *internal* and not in the external factor? To assume that it may not is to beg the very question. The hypothesis that the internal factors differ not in degree, but *in kind*, answers the difficulty completely, meets all the facts, and is abundantly supported by other arguments, as we have before seen and shall hereafter see.

Mr. Spencer's position might be thus paralleled. The impossibility of establishing a distinction between a piano and kitchen-table may be clearly demonstrated. If the sounds emitted by the first on receiving serial blows from finger-tips, are vibrations of its substance in response to such stimuli; and if the sounds emitted by the second on receiving such blows, are vibrations of its substance in response to such stimuli, then any alleged distinction can have no other basis than some difference in the characters of the blows to which the vibrations respond!

It must never be forgotten that "*instinct*" is the BLIND adaptation of means to ends, while reason is its CONSCIOUS adaptation. No amount of *blindness* can make *sight*!

Next (p. 454, § 204), we have an attempt specifically to describe the evolution of memory and reason. And, indeed, it is easy work to show that instinct graduates into reason when a definition of reason is adopted which does not imply rationality, and when a practice is made of calling purely instinctive actions *rational*. A rational action is described (p. 455) as "a confusion of nascent motor excitations" resulting in non-action as long as such excitations "go on superseding one another," and ultimately overcome by "the strongest group" passing "into action." He tells us "an action thus produced is nothing else than a *rational action*." Each of the actions which we call rational presents three "corresponding phases":—First, "a certain combination of impressions"; second, "a nascent excitation of the nervous agents before concerned in such actions, either as producers of them or as affected by the production of them"; and, third, "the actions themselves, which are simply the results of this nascent excitation rising into actual excitation."

Here is given as a description of reason, characters which fit in exactly with the higher order of instinctive actions, and so, naturally enough, we have given us as examples of *reason*, such actions as those of throwing a stone at a snarling dog, shaving, and tying a neckerchief, actions which may all three conceivably, and the first actually, be performed without a scintilla of reason. His account of the imaginative phenomena involved in pelting the dog no more involve reason than does

the retreat of the dog when he sees the actions preliminary to stone-throwing. And here a contradiction may be noted. He says (p. 456), "ideas are nothing else than weak repetitions of the psychical states caused by actual impressions and motions." But at page 182 he told us that "an idea results when a vivid feeling is assimilated to, or coheres with, one or more of the faint feelings left [once more, *where?*] by such vivid feelings previously experienced." Of course this contradiction is not one of moment, as the author's aim can be easily divined. Still it is noteworthy as an index of general confusion of mind.

He goes on (p. 458, § 205) to explain *inference* as mere association, making, of course, use of what has gone before, and saying, "we lately *saw*," what I contend we not only did not, but could not see—namely, the passage of instinctive actions into rational actions and *vice versa*. When I cease to look at a tree, the tree continues to exist to others, but *my* vision of a tree is gone, it has not passed into other people. So when I cease to adopt means to ends *consciously*, my *consciousness* of the adaptation is gone—it does not pass into the adapted actions. That sensible, imaginative association may be the material basis of reason—i.e., that such neurosis may serve the intellect as an instrument is likely enough; that it *is* reason, is quite another matter.

Next (p. 460, § 206) he proceeds to explain the higher forms of rationality out of the lower, and he argues that because the infant, which is (he says) as irrational as the dog, becomes rational, therefore the whole process is gradual. But it does not follow that, because if we knew nothing human but this new-born infant, we could not assert its rationality; therefore until we know how it develops, we are prevented from asserting that it must have been potentially rational even before its birth. At a still earlier period the infant had no faculty to distinguish it from the lowest animals—indeed, from a vegetable; but that does not prevent its having been *really* different *ab initio*, and from having had (as the event shows) very different powers latent. Our reason reveals to us what the impotence of our senses does not enable us to detect. By saying that "every one is bound to admit that as the rationality of the infant is no higher than that of a dog," &c., he begs the whole question. I do not admit it. I say the assertion of such an equality is an utter absurdity. But let any one examine a very young child for himself: at a very early period (say at the age of three or four months) the infant's eye gives an intelligent response to yours such as no mature brute's ever does!

He speaks of successive experiences sufficing "for the unfolding of reason in the individual." This is true; but it would not be so were not reason first *unfolded* in him. That there has been an increasing manifestation of reason in human history I readily concede; but I reckon as absurd his assertion (p. 462), that "unless it be asserted that the rational faculty of the cultivated European is essentially different from that of a savage or a child, it cannot be asserted that there is any essential difference between brute reason and human reason." Moreover, as to rational evolution in civilization, I can by no means admit, as he asserts, that "this advance is as great as that from the higher forms of brute rationality to the lower forms of human rationality." He tells us that this is what "no one who compares the generalizations of a Hottentot with those of La Place can deny." But I both *can* and *do*. The difference between counting two and the highest calculus is one of degree, and trivial compared with that which exists between counting two and not counting at all.*

Next (p. 463, § 207) he tries to show that the law of psychical cohesion solves the highest as well as the lowest mental phenomena. He does this by elaborate examples of alphabetic symbols of diverse experiences having some points in common, with a consequent psychical cohesion of the constants, and by saying that such cohesions will increase with the development of the nervous system. But such automatic registration of sensible impressions is not reason—is no rational perception of being, order, and truth. Nor could any number of sensible impressions give rise to such perceptions save when brought to bear upon a rational nature. Whatever he may say, reasoning and inference can no more than intuition be reduced to mere association.

Finally (p. 465, § 208) he attempts to show how his doctrine reconciles the experiential and a priori hypothesis through evolution. And here he shows his ignorance of peripateticism by speaking as if nothing opposed empiricism but the Kantian doctrine,—just as Lewes does also. Yet he himself uses a peripateticism when he says (pp. 469, 470), "Doubtless, experiences received by the individual furnish the concrete materials for all thought."

His arguments on the nerve-construction necessary in man in order to enable him to use his experiences as he does, and not like other animals, is in fact but an argument that a "rational animal," if not "evolved" as to its corpus, must,

* As to this whole question see "Lessons from Nature," chapters iv., v., and vi.

as to these points, have been created with a corpus just such as if it had been evolved from other animals.

CHAPTER VIII.—THE FEELINGS.

The following is a short statement of the contents of the several sections of this eighth chapter :—§209. Feelings are inseparable from intellectual processes ; §210. No emotion can be free from cognition ; §211. Feeling and thought are necessarily antithetical, (§212) and so are feeling and automatic action ; §213. Complex feelings arise from associated passed feelings, (§214) and thus arise the more complex human emotions ; §215. Feelings are the stronger, according as they include many nascent sensations, and therefore the most evolved emotions are the strongest ; §216. They act through and by heredity also, and thus our innate feelings may be explained.

The first paragraph asserts that no kind of feeling is wholly free from the intellectual element ; and he begins (p. 472) by saying that "feelings are involved with, and inseparable from, intellectual processes." This latter proposition is, in fact, identical with scholasticism, which asserts that phantasmata are necessary to our intellectual activity. But in justification of the first, he refers to his own past errors, saying, "We saw that mind is composed of feelings and the relations between feelings," which I denied ; and he also assumes as demonstrated the gradual transition of feeling into thought, which I denied. Also, that "the relational element of mind is the intellectual element," which I denied, except as its material and occasion. Nevertheless, his proposition is in one sense right. It is so because we have but one soul, and therefore no conscious action, even though merely organic, can in us be free from the intellectual element, since that one soul is intellectual. But this fact does not make the feelings and emotions of brutes in the least intellectual ; nor does it even make such states of man intellectual, except in so far as his soul is intellectual, and that his consciousness may be directed by his will upon such feelings and emotions.

Next (p. 473, §210), he compares "inference" with a "fit of anger," saying, "No emotion can be *absolutely* free from cognition." But this I deny : dogs may have emotion even in sleep ; but they need not on that account have *intellectual* cognition attributed to them ; and, for reasons already given, such cognition may be allowed to be always latent in our emotions, and there need be no objection to the assertion that it is rare for intellectual cognition to be *absolutely* free

from emotion,—near and remote associations of feelings being “habitually in some degree agreeable or disagreeable” (p. 474).

Next (p. 475, § 211) he considers the antithetical relation between intelligence (e. g. perception) and feeling (e. g. sensation), and well shows how the material basis of thought, the sensible cognition of relations (or changes), conflicts with an emotion which is a complex of feelings integrated into one. Thus he explains how it is that, whilst we analyze a gratification, the gratification in that gratification is suspended. I demur, however, to his remark that “consciousness continues only in virtue of this conflict.” Even in man as he is, I am not at all sure that “consciousness” cannot exist for an appreciable time without mental change—nay, I feel persuaded that it can, and no one can deny but that it might do so in an immortal condition where the physical limitations imposed by our nervous structures did not exist.

Then (p. 478, § 212) he considers the antithesis between feeling and automatic action, which, I consider, he exaggerates; I think it evident much automatic action—like the swallowing an object placed far back in the mouth—is very distinctly felt. He says (p. 479), “An entire absence of memory and reason is accompanied by an entire absence of feeling.” But has a star-fish no feeling? or, on the other hand, is it rational? He illustrates his position by example of “practice makes perfect.” But, indeed, this very argument here tends to show more clearly the radical distinctness of *mind* from associated feelings. He says that “memory and reason disappear when, by perpetual repetition, the psychical changes become automatic.” Yet for all that, by our will we can attend to those of our actions which have thus grown most automatic, and so *voluntarily* restore to consciousness what has organically passed into a sort of reflex action.

He next (p. 481, § 213) proceeds to consider the genesis of complex feelings from associations of past pleasurable sensations, and his account of “desire” or “fear” as having “in a slight degree such psychical states” as, e. g., catching and eating, or being hunted and hurt. But to call “a desire to eat” a slight feeling of eating is an example of H. Spencer’s incomplete analysis. It is that, but it is also more—it is that plus the propension to seek pleasure, as fear is imagination plus the propension to avoid pain.

Next (p. 483, § 214), he treats of highly-compounded human emotions, and explains our enjoyment of a beautiful view as essentially similar to the pleasurable feeling of a brute smelling prey, such smell giving rise in it to vague images

of past agglutinated pleasures; and that there is this analogy, and that such may be the sensible basis of human emotion, I care not to deny.

Again (p. 486, § 215) he draws a corollary that "feelings are strong in proportion as they include many actual, or nascent sensations, or both." And he illustrates it by calling attention to the fact that "actions are determined by the accumulation of motives." From this follows a second corollary, "the higher the evolution, the stronger the emotion, if the feelings are of any intense kind," e.g. human sexual feeling, and also love of money or liberty; this because resulting totals of composition must grow larger.

Finally (p. 491, § 216), he asserts that such emotional tendencies are inherited and developed by experience. As to the experience hypothesis, he says: "The doctrine that all the desires, all the sentiments, are generated by the experience of the individual, is so glaringly at variance with facts, that I cannot but wonder how any one should ever have entertained it." Yet this was long the popular doctrine with English psychologists, and has still its disciples. Mr. Spencer's own doctrine will, perhaps, excite a similar wonder hereafter in those who realize all that is contained in our self-consciousness and our highest intuitions. Here, Mr. Spencer, like Mr. Lewes, says, in effect, "we were absurdly wrong before, but hear us now!"

Chapter VIII., on the feelings, is an exceedingly interesting, and in many respects admirable chapter; but no facts brought forward in it are inconsistent with the view that in the human sensible nervous actions, answering to those of brutes, there acts a higher principle, which takes up and transfigures them, so that the *material* love and *fidelity* of the dog become the formal love and fidelity of man.

CHAPTER IX.—THE WILL.

The sections of this chapter may be thus stated: § 217, Will results from the failure of automatic actions. § 218, 'Tis the upsetting of an unstable balance between competing sets of ideal-motor changes. § 219, The notion of free-will arises from a belief in a substantial *Ego*. § 220, Were it possible, it would act badly and hinder adjustment.

First (p. 495), he says that, "Will is but another aspect of the general process resulting from the non-automatic organization of the more complex psychical changes." But here several passages call for remark. And, first, we have again an example of Mr. Spencer's want of analysis. He speaks

of "psychical changes, which, not being organically determined, take place with some *deliberation*, and therefore consciously." But by "deliberation" all he here means is "slowly," i.e. with oscillating impulses; but between oscillations of sensible impulse and self-conscious choice there is a hiatus indeed!

Again, he assumes that "all modes of consciousness *can be* nothing else than incidents of the correspondence between the organism and its environment." But this just begs the question of the "determined" or "non-determined" nature of will.

Again (p. 496, § 218) he says, that in the reflex order, "none of the phenomena of consciousness proper, exist." "In it," no, but they may co-exist with it, as in swallowing, and the *ejaculatio seminis*; and such facts alone refute Mr. Spencer's position.

Next (p. 496), he represents the origin of will as the upsetting of a balance "between two sets of ideal motor changes." He tells us: "When, after the reception of one of the more complex impressions, the appropriate motor changes become nascent, but are prevented from passing into immediate action by the antagonism of certain other nascent motor changes appropriate to some nearly allied impression; there is constituted a state of consciousness which, when it finally issues in action, displays what we term volition." He further remarks as a summing up: "Thus the cessation of automatic action, and the dawn of volition are one and the same thing." He illustrates and confirms his theory by the automatic character, which long-practised voluntary acts assume—as the movement of the legs in walking. But all this only confirms what no one denies, namely, that the great majority of our actions (including all our most trivial ones) are automatic, and that the *liberum arbitrium* is, in comparison, but very rarely called into play. That it is *not* the true account of our deliberate choice, on critical occasions (of that between the competing objects, to which we will to direct our attention), our consciousness suffices to inform us—we do not recognize in it an account of that active "choice" (as distinguished from a passive witnessing of the oversetting of an unstable equilibrium) which our mental experience assures us we exercise—assures us as plainly as it assures us we exist.

Further (p. 500, § 219), he speaks of the illusion of free-will, which he makes to consist in our supposing "that we are something more than the aggregate of feelings and ideas, actual and nascent, momentarily existing." And here, indeed,

we come upon one of the primary, fundamental, and most fatal blots of Mr. Spencer's system. If he realized what he knew in knowing his own self-consciousness,* he would not dispute the freedom of his volition. The non-acceptance of this "supposition" (that the *Ego* is something more than its passing state) as a primary fact of consciousness is one of his radical errors from which the most fatal defects logically follow.

He remarks: "that every one is at liberty to desire or not to desire, which is the real proposition involved in the dogma of free-will, is negatived as much by the analysis of consciousness as by the contents of the preceding chapters." But the doctrine is that every one can act against certain stronger desires for the sake of some weaker ones. Not of course that a man who has led a vicious life can ordinarily at once lead a saintly one, but that in some of his acts he is able to will a course a little better than his desires solicit him to will. The co-existence of the strongest desires towards vice with persistence in the practice of virtue, is no rare phenomenon in Christian experience.

Speaking of the *Ego*, he says (p. 501): "If it is present in consciousness, then, as it is ever present, it can be at each moment nothing else than the state of consciousness, simple or compound, passing at that moment." But why so? It may be ever present directly, and yet only occasionally, reflexly recognized and made its own object. It *must* be something more, or else it could not deliberate, compare objects,—say two hand-writings,—or distinguish different states of consciousness. Still less could it search and seek to recall a known (though now absent and when found recognized) state of consciousness. He also tells us (pp. 501, 502) that to assert a man's freewill "is to say that he determines the cohesions of the psychical states which arouse the action." To this I reply—and so he *does*—by *attention*, and voluntary, and intentional repetition, he *can* make psychical states cohere, and by attention he can give *weight* to certain selected motives, and so, while always following the stronger motive, yet act freely, since he can make one stronger than another by such attention.

Finally (p. 503, § 220), he represents free-will as undesirable. He represents it as necessarily resulting in lawlessness and irregularity; but this by no means follows, on account of the narrow margin of choice left to each of us in each act. No one pretends that a man can make himself extraordinarily virtuous

* See "Lessons from Nature," chapter i.

or vicious at once, but that he can tend to become either, by means of small, free efforts in either direction upon certain occasions.

Again, he strangely remarks that if there is such a thing as freewill "no science of psychology is possible," yet that science has been elaborated and taught for centuries by men who have accepted freewill. He represents freewill as necessarily impeding social progress; I do not believe this, but however this may be, certainly human social evolution displays retrogressions and disintegrations which conflict with the existence of an evolution of merely sentient nature. It may well be that temporary accumulations of bad-will in nations determine these notable moral and social degradations. The facts seem to tell *in favour* of the exercise of such freedom. If freewill exists, the more well-exercised freedom there is, the more regularity and order there should be. As Joly well shows, the facts of statistics tell against, not in favour of, the views of Buckle.

He concludes the chapter (p. 503) as follows. Will is the outcome of incomplete adjustments; what is desirable is the complete adjustment of inner to outer relations. Such adjustment tends to be brought about by the play of the forces of the universe. "Were the inner relations partly determined by some other agency, the harmony at any moment existing would be disturbed, and the advance to a higher harmony impeded. There would be a retardation of that grand progress which is bearing humanity onwards to a *higher* intelligence and a *nobler* character." We may well ask what can these comparatives mean?

Mr. Spencer's notion of the perfection of mental nature is certainly a curious notion. We have just seen that *volition* is the attendant of an imperfect adjustment, also that automatic unconsciousness is the accompaniment of perfect adjustment. Before we saw that *memory* was a transitional condition, disappearing with completeness of organization. Also that *reason* was once more but imperfect adjustment—a failure in instinct—and that with perfection of adjustment unconsciousness supervened. Finally, he has told us that *feeling* disappears with memory and reason. Therefore the highest mental nature would be that "in which volition, intelligence, memory, and even feeling have all disappeared in favour of a perfect adjustment. In other words, the most highly developed human being would be an absolutely SENSELESS AND UNCONSCIOUS AUTOMATON. This is the "*higher*" and "*nobler*" goal to which the countless pulsations of cosmic forces are supposed to be ultimately tending in their integrating and

constructive action, the object to promote which our most strenuous and self-denying efforts and our most fervent desires may most worthily be directed."*

In this fourth part Mr. Spencer continues to apply his interpretation of mental states as phases and factors in the correspondence of inner to outer relations; i.e., he continues to apply it to the various mental powers taken in detail. I most readily admit that much of what he says applies to that sensible basis of which intellect makes use; that his law or rule of the growth of intelligence is really a law or rule of the growth of imagination; that his exposition of volition and emotion applies perfectly to the emotions and, so-called, volitions of brutes, as does his account of reason to their sensible inferences (association), and of memory to their sensible reminiscence. But Mr. Spencer takes no note of memory, reason, and will, as made known to us by our own consciousness in their highest forms; e.g. the search for forgotten thoughts, the perception of the relatedness of relations, the deliberate selection of the less-desired of two motives. Consequently his attempt fails, though much that he says may be usefully employed to elucidate the highest psychical powers of irrational animals, also the sensible basis of intellectual action, and intellectual action itself in so far as directly connected with that imaginative basis. He also supplies us with a mode of understanding madness as the result of physical conditions modifying sensation or deranging imagination or both.

PART V.

The fifth part Mr. Spencer entitles "PHYSICAL SYNTHESIS." In it he shows how that continuous process naturally caused (which Part IV. translated into terms of reflex action and will) may be interpreted as a cumulative result of physical conditions which conform to known principles. In other words, mental acts are here interpreted in terms of matter and motion, first by a sketch of the genesis of the nervous system doubly compound, and then by showing how the nervous functions translated into mental states harmonize with the physical conception; the ultimate outcome being that matter and mind are alike unanalyzable, and are both caused by one inscrutable entity which is neither.

CHAPTER I.—A FURTHER INTERPRETATION NEEDED.

Here (p. 507) he tells us (§ 221) that it remains to interpret

* "Lessons from Nature," Murray, 1876, p. 235.

the objective side of mental evolution in terms of matter and motion, and proceeds (p. 508, § 222) to the general way in which he thinks it possible to annex his doctrine of psychical evolution to his doctrine of physical evolution. Differing *toto cœlo* as I do from him as to what is psychical evolution and the true meaning of physical evolution, it is not necessary to linger over any statement in this chapter, nor indeed over much in the whole of this fifth part.

CHAPTER II.—THE GENESIS OF NERVES.

First (p. 511, § 223) he lays down that the line of least resistance to the transmission of an incident force through an organism will be that of isomerically transformable, unstable molecules. Here it may be worth while to note a passing expression—he says (p. 512): “When there is anything in the circumstances of an animal’s life involving that a sensation in one particular place is habitually followed by a contraction in another particular place,” &c. But that is just it! Such a power must be *involved* before it can be *evolved*, and such a sequence to be possible implies an organization of some kind already existing. You cannot have the form without the matter, any more than the matter without the form.

Next (p. 515, § 224) he tells us such a line of least resistance must tend to become more distinct and broader by repeated traversings, and finally (p. 519, § 225) that such diminished resistance forms an approach towards equilibrium between the organism and incident forces.

And here we may remark that granting his hypothesis as to nervous tissue’s generation, yet the transmission of such elaborated structures to offspring is as mysterious as the phenomenon he explains. His speculations are very ingenious, but futile, and all this part about nerves is really *beside the question*.

CHAPTER III.—THE GENESIS OF SIMPLE NERVOUS SYSTEMS.

Here we have exemplifications of the process the existence of which Mr. Spencer supposes; and first (p. 521, § 226) he cites the long tentacles of such as *Physalia* undifferentiated [as he says] into nervous and muscular tissue, and he gives the quicker contraction of the longer structures of the kind as confirmatory of his views.

Then (p. 522, § 227) we meet with ingenious speculations as to the genesis of a nervous system in an actiniform animal, and afterwards (p. 524, § 228) speculations as to the origin of a ganglion from a point when nervous influence tends to

radiate. Objections are met (p. 527, § 229) by suggestions as to complications necessarily arising from the cross radiations of channels necessarily resulting in the development of a ganglion. Finally (p. 530, § 230) objections (drawn from the difficulty of supposing the initiation of such transmission between the places separated by a considerable interval) are met by calling attention to the small size of the polyzoa, where the nearest approach to Mr. H. Spencer's hypothetical "simple nervous system" is found. But *small size* does not render the conception really easier. Once more, nothing can be evolved which has not been first involved. You cannot have function without structure. Again, different new nervous systems have been discovered in lower organisms since this work appeared—i.e. since 1870, as e.g. in *Actinia* by Dr. Duncan, and by Mr. Romanes in jelly-fishes.

CHAPTER IV.—THE GENESIS OF COMPOUND NERVOUS SYSTEMS.

First (p. 532, § 231) he gives us his conception of how an eye-spot may have been formed. To the natural question which rises to our lips, "How can a modification of nutrition by light or by sound become sight or hearing?" he replies by anticipation: "We may infer that rudimentary vision is constituted by the wave of disturbance which a sudden change in the states of these pigment-grains propagates through the body."

Next (p. 533, § 232) we have the genesis of the connection of this primitive sense-organ with primitive nerve-supply going to muscle. Then follows (p. 534, § 233) a speculation as to the origin of two eyes and two sets of lateral muscles, all connected by cross relations.

To this follows (p. 537, § 234) an account of a hypothetical genesis of more complex eyes, and finally (p. 539, § 235) that of a complex central ganglion, such latter genesis being brought about through its receipt of many converging impulses.

CHAPTER V.—THE GENESIS OF DOUBLY-COMPOUND NERVOUS SYSTEMS.

In this chapter (p. 542, § 236) we come to consider manifestly more complex conditions brought about by the action of various kinds of stimuli; and Mr. Spencer lays down (p. 543, § 237) that for the more complex resulting actions, a proportionate and corresponding nervous centre must be needed and thus (p. 546, § 238), that a protuberance must be gradually produced about such centre, such protuberance being

related to the most complex adjustments. To this follows (p. 546, § 239) the consideration that change of bodily place, as distinguished from mere movements of parts of the body, must alter the aspect of objects, and therefore their action upon the moving being, and causes successive changes in the responsive motor actions correspondingly rendered nascent. Then co-ordinations, he tells us (p. 551, § 240), are brought about by the superposition of intercalated plexuses on such nervous centres. Next (p. 553, § 241) he observes that the relational elements requiring co-ordination are of two classes, those of space and those of time. These co-ordinations are, he affirms, severally effected by the cerebellum and cerebrum respectively. Finally (p. 557, § 242) he remarks apologetically, that this chapter is only intended as a general statement offered with the intention of making the possibility of such a process as that suggested conceivable. It is not intended as an accurate description.

It may also be remarked that actual inaccuracies are here to be found of a nature to throw grave doubts on the general value of Mr. Spencer's scientific generalizations.

Abundant reasons show that the cerebellum does not co-ordinate space relation, while the cerebrum is plainly connected with locomotive activity. If the cerebellum and cerebrum were related as he says, fishes must be capable of vastly greater co-ordination in time than in space, which amounts to a *reductio ad absurdum*. Moreover, there are men of his own kidney (e.g. Mr. Lewes), who mock at the idea of an organ of co-ordination at all; and it is worthy of note that no pretence is made of any special organ of memory, of intellect, or of volition.

As to the cerebellum, if it were the organ of "space" (and the cerebrum of "time") in brutes, it could only be the organ of the *material* cognizance of such relations. We have, then, no bodily organ for the *formal* recognition of such abstractions. Yet such an organ would be needful (on Mr. Spencer's system), because such formal cognition belongs to a different *order* from sensations. Sensations can give material perception of time and space *as* experienced, but abstract time and space never are experienced any more than abstract "horse," and to directly sensibly cognize a horse as a horse is a very different thing from reflexly recognizing it as a horse intellectually.

CHAPTER VI.—FUNCTIONS AS RELATED TO THESE STRUCTURES.

Here (p. 559, § 243) he declares that nervous actions must now be translated into mental states. Then (p. 559, § 244)

he accounts for the generation of consciousness (!) by a delay in the transmission of stimuli through a ganglion, and tries to show how the chaotic impressions of objects are slowly evolved into a slightly organized consciousness of environing objects. In fact, he sketches (p. 561) very well how the nascent sensibility of brutes might arise, and become in them sensible perception. Then (p. 562, § 245) we have the excitation of visual perceptions compared with the varied chords of a piano, which should have the power of exciting itself to give out faint reproductions of others, formerly allied in experience with those experienced now. To this follows (p. 564, § 246) a sketch of the generation of ideas by means of most complex involutions and evolutions of sensations, symbolized by a *piano mécanique*. And here some criticisms may be made. He makes (pp. 564, 565) a good admission (like Lewes) of the passive character of brutes. He says:—"Its nervous system is played upon by external objects, the clustered properties of which draw out answering chords of feelings, followed by faintly-reverberating chords of further feelings; but it is otherwise passive—it cannot evolve a consciousness that is independent of the immediate environment."

His description of "ideas, rightly so called," might be applied to mere imagination. He says:—"They acquire a separateness from direct impressions as fast as there increase those series of clustered sensations which unite the visual sensations received from objects out of reach with the tactual sensations afterwards yielded by such objects." But these are mere sensible perceptions and imaginations—not ideas; and no such imaginative clusters suffice to explain such ideas as e.g. being, truth, goodness, substance, the soul, virtue, God, &c. And this objection applies to the whole of the complications suggested in this section, they remain always of the *same order*, merely imaginative, never truly intellectual.

To this follows (p. 568, § 247) an account of emotion, as being the arousing of the reverberating echoes of past chords and cadences of feelings, and of feelings of kindred kinds, first struck during an immeasurable past. He gives what is possibly a true, and is certainly a very ingenious account of the genesis by heredity of brutes' emotions.

Finally (p. 572, § 248) he discusses phrenology, saying it is only true as to certain broad facts, and inasmuch as science shows that all faculties tend to localize. In this chapter we have no real explanation of the origin of self-consciousness or intellect from sense. The highest faculties are ignored as distinct, and are leagued with animal imagination.

Mr. G. H. Lewes speaks with scorn of such a conception, and for him the intervention of the "social organism" is necessary. What he says may be well used against Mr. Herbert Spencer, and in defence of the radical distinctness of "*intellect*."

CHAPTER VII.—PSYCHICAL LAWS AS THUS INTERPRETED.

First (p. 577, § 249) Mr. Spencer here lays down that it is time to compare the deductions of foregoing chapters as to a physical principle with the laws of mental action, i.e. to see how his conceptions of waves of force traversing molecules fits with mental facts of daily experience.

Next (p. 577, § 250) he shows the congruity between the established laws of psychical association with the physical principle. Connections between feelings being strong when they are vivid, and, between limits, becoming more connected by means of repetition.

After this (p. 579, § 251) he considers habit, and shows how acts at first disagreeable become less so, as channels at first obstructed become permeable; and thus indeed may be explained the acquisition of artificial habits and tricks by brutes.

Again (p. 580, § 252) he applies his rule to different degrees of human intelligence in sex and race, and shows how the higher has greater suspense of judgment in decision, and more modifiability than lower ones. And indeed this statement of his is valuable, as supplying what may be the true, imaginative, sensible basis of which the mind makes use. He says (p. 582): "Ignorant people generalize hastily, and adhere obstinately to the erroneous conclusions based on their scanty experiences; while the highly-instructed man is able to keep his judgment undecided—waits for more evidence, contemplates other possible inferences than the one he is inclined to draw, and is ready to abandon or to qualify his conviction when he discovers facts at variance with it." This is true, and were it only on this account, the moral nature of unbelief must be necessarily more or less different in the eleventh and nineteenth centuries respectively.

Finally (p. 582) he considers (§ 253) emotion, and shows how on the same principle it should, as in fact it does, grow less fitful as its evolution proceeds. Here again we have good matter for describing the material, imaginative basis of intellectual emotion, and the reason of fitfulness, &c., so long as self-conscious will does not intervene. He incidentally (p. 584) remarks: "The formation of sudden, irreversible con-

clusions on the slenderest evidence, is less distant from reflex action than is the formation of deliberate and modifiable conclusions after much evidence has been collected." Now, we have seen that the most unerring actions are reflex. It may, then, have been a great advantage to early states of society to have such quasi-reflex convictions. Moreover, to those who believe that our faculties have been formed to cognize objective truth, there may well be an evident resemblance and parallelism between reflex action and the direct intuition of important truths on the exhibition of very slight but yet appropriate evidence.

CHAPTER VIII.—EVIDENCE FROM NORMAL VARIATIONS.

Here (p. 585, § 254) Mr. Spencer declares it to be now necessary to "note the several circumstances, general and local, which modify the influence of the same outer agent on the same inner part, and observe the correspondence between the variations of physical effect and the accompanying variations of psychical effect." In fact, studying psychical states in varied physiological conditions and expressing them in physical terms, such e.g. as of a fluid traversing channels.

Next (p. 587, § 255) the phenomena in youth and age are considered, and shown to be thus expressible.

Afterwards (p. 589, § 256) he considers two men, one in a vigorous, the other in a feeble constitutional state, with like results as to expressibility.

Then (p. 591, § 257) the same individual is considered as he is in a high and in a low constitutional state.

To this follows (p. 592, § 258) a consideration of the phenomena of sleep and dreams; and then (p. 594, § 259) the stimulation of particular parts of the organism is treated of and it is shown how nerve force is thus subtracted from elsewhere, as after violent running, we are unfit for involved mental processes. Then (p. 596, § 260) emotion is considered, and its draughting-off power noted, as when emotion caused by the presence of a spectator may cause a billiard-player to miss his stroke.

Finally (p. 598, § 261), pleasures and pains are considered in relation to general depression, and it is represented that lowness of vitality produces melancholy, because pain channels are more permeable (pains being more vivid than pleasures) than pleasure channels; and, therefore, preferentially allow weak currents to traverse them. But, at least, we may note that great happiness sometimes coexists with extreme weakness, as in many bed-ridden estatics and dying saints.

As to Mr. Spencer's whole view there is no need to contest that the imaginative basis of intellectual life may be represented by the symbols he chooses. He himself says (p. 586) : "Admitting that though the molecular motion which works nervous effects is not a fluid, and its transfer not a current, they may be *conveniently dealt with as though they were.*" No doubt a false hypothesis is often convenient, and as to Mr. Spencer's "molecular motions," &c., we may say they are not true objectively, but none the less "they may be conveniently dealt with as though they were."

CHAPTER IX.—EVIDENCE FROM ABNORMAL VARIATIONS.

Here (p. 604, § 262) he endeavours to show how his theory applies to the fretfulness of the sick child and the irritability of the nervous invalid. He accounts for it by the plexuses which co-ordinate destructive and defensive actions being inherited from a much more ancient time than those related to amiable emotions; and being, therefore, more permeable by weak currents.

Next, (p. 606, § 263) he considers the psychical excitements from congestion of nervous plexuses, and then (p. 608, § 264), permanent insanity resulting from permanent alteration of various channels. Not but that impure blood may produce temporary insanity (§ 265), as (p. 609) is shown by the employment of poisons and narcotics. The case of the latter illustrates what was before said as to radiation into narrow channels under high nervous pressure. Next (p. 610, § 266), he states that on the whole the phenomena as produced by the employment of anæsthetics conform to what has been said as to the highest complexities of nervous structure being the first to be paralyzed. Nevertheless he concludes (p. 612, § 267) the interpretations given are not to be taken separately, but altogether: he is sure in the bulk they harmonize with the general principle set forth.

Once more we may admit that what he says is good as as applied to the imaginative basis of rationality; but, as usual, the intellect and will themselves are both ignored.

CHAPTER X.—RESULTS.

The contents of the sections of this chapter may be thus summarized. (§ 268). Thus (the inheritability of nervous changes being admitted) all has been explained in preceding sections of part V. (§ 269). The explanation offered is not *really* more materialist than that of the most common sort, e.g., brain gone, man dead. (§ 270). Again, matter is *not* ignoble—First

hypothetical reply (§ 271): Mind may be explained as motion. Second hypothetical reply; like activities of Ether (§ 272). These replies fit Mr. Spencer's own answers: Mind is only thinkable in terms of matter and matter in terms of mind, the antithesis of subject and object being ultimate. (§ 273). The evolution of both follows one common law, therefore, one inscrutable entity underlies both matter and mind; the one ultimate reality is manifested, both subjectively and objectively. Here (p. 614), he claims to have explained all psychological phenomena in his part V., i.e., if it be taken for granted that nervous changes "arising from functional actions" as well as spontaneously, can be inherited.

Then (p. 616, § 269), he most truly remarks in reply to exclamations of "Materialism!": "The general relation between mental manifestations and material structures traced out in the foregoing chapters has implications identical with, and no wider than, those which familiar experiences thrust upon us"; e.g., that when the brains are out the man will die, &c. All the varied correspondences and involutions, &c., traced out by Mr. Spencer, amounting really to no more than that union of body and soul which all admit. Next (p. 617, § 270) he exclaims in a supposed reply of a "Materialist of the cruder sort," matter is by no means ignoble. And here (pp. 617, 618) he gives a fine passage as to a piece of steel, which may be quoted in opposition to those who demur to unconscious, quasi-intelligent action on the part of brutes. But after speaking of the wonderful pulsations and oscillations which on his molecular theory are supposed to exist in all directions, and reminding us how spectrum analysis shows that units of sodium on which sunlight falls beat "in unison with their kindred units more than ninety millions of miles off," he concludes as follows:—"This, then, is the form of being you speak of so contemptuously. And, because I ascribe to this form of being powers which though not more wonderful than these are more involved, you scowl at me. If, instead of saying that I degrade mind to a level with matter, you were to say that I elevate matter to a level with mind, you would express the fact more nearly." These words are not, of course, said in Mr. Spencer's own person, but still he must suppose them to have some little force and sense. Yet how really unreasonable! All this continual "oscillation" constitutes no elevation. Compared with mind, particles are not one wit more noble, let them perform what unceasing, complex gyrations they may. The wonder is, that any mortal man should think that another might be such a dolt as to suppose they were a trifle "higher" for this restlessness.

After this (p. 620, § 271) he gives the hypothetical reply of another opponent supposed to understand better the meaning of the truths science reveals, and whose reply Mr. Spencer terms (p. 624) "comparatively consistent." This materialist identifies "mind" with "motion" of an "insensible kind" to "combined undulations of the all-pervading imponderable substance, which we know of only by inference from their effects." Here we have the "oscillations" again. He goes on: "The activities of this imponderable substance, though far simpler, and in that respect *far lower* (!) than the activities we call mind, are at the same time far higher than those we call mind in respect of their intensity, their velocity, their subtlety." So that quick and strong vibrations, else very complex motions, are relatively high, using that word in the sense we apply it to mind. Thus exceedingly complex gyrations of atoms are higher than is "love of virtue" !

He goes on to say that though mind can construct a burning glass, it cannot act as one, and that light travels "many million times quicker" than ideas and volitions do. But thought, if we are to talk of its "travelling" at all, can go to the sun in an instant, while light takes ten minutes. In fact however we can only speak of its "travelling" by a figure of speech.

Afterwards (p. 623) he goes on to denounce the conception of spirit as a survival of savage thought, unsatisfactory and without evidence; and he says it cannot be thought of save "as occupying a separate place in space," and with "such materiality as is implied by limits." But the difference is between the extended and the unextended. The unextended may be absolutely limitless and occupy no place in space, or it may like our souls while we live, be unextended throughout our bodies, and accidentally through them occupy space. He vaunts his view, saying: "Mind, I identify with that which is not relatively immaterial, but absolutely immaterial. It has not even the inconceivably refined materiality of the ether, which fills what you call empty space." I do not speak of "empty space," but I no more dream of making spirit material, like ether, than Mr. Spencer does. He goes on: "but, it is assimilable to the activities manifested by this ether, as well as by all sensible forms of being." Pray are not the activities of beings just as extended as the parts which perform such activities?

Next (p. 624, § 272) he gives what is really his own answer to the objector who opposes materialism, and he says that mind being only thinkable in terms of matter and matter in terms of mind, while the evolutions of both follow one law,

therefore, each is not to be analyzed, the antithesis of subject and object being ultimate. He tells us: "Carried to whatever extent, the inquiries of the psychologist do not reveal the ultimate nature of mind." This is true, but they may reveal a sufficient and practically adequate knowledge, though not an exhaustive one—one very different from anything given in Mr. Spencer's system. Similarly he tells us that the real nature of nervous or mental shocks is unknown. Nevertheless he represents and treats them as practically known for his purpose, namely, as something approaching nutritive change. In his system, higher phenomena are ever explained by lower, to which they thus become practically reduced,—the last term reached is the *lowest* term,—and thus his system cannot but have a most antitheistic tendency. He remarks (p. 625): "The conception of a rhythmically-moving mass of sensible matter is a synthesis of certain states of consciousness that stand related in a certain succession." No! it is more than this, it is a perception of a relation *as a relation*.

Again he says: "Our experience of a rhythmically-moving mass, whence the conception of it is derived, are states of mind having objective counterparts that are unknown." This I deny.

At the next page he makes a noteworthy admission, "The conception of a state of consciousness implies the conception of an existence which has the state." But he adds: "We can form no notion of mind absolutely divested of attributes connoted by the word substance; and all such attributes are abstracted from our experiences of material phenomena." Truly we cannot imagine it except by means of some phantasm of extension; but attributes of substance, though primarily abstracted from material substance, are not declared by our reason to be necessarily limited to material substance. Mind—enduring being undergoing affections in its substance—can thus be thought of as absolutely immaterial, though, of course, it cannot be imagined. He continues: "Expel from the conception of mind every one of those attributes by which we distinguish an external something from an external nothing, and the conception of mind becomes nothing." To the imagination it does so, but not to the intellect.

He further says (p. 627): "We know nothing of cause save as manifested in existences we class as material,—either our own bodies or surrounding things." This is false, "cause" is no doubt first intued through sensible experience; but we have afterwards acquaintance with it, as our will operating upon our internal mental states. He goes on, "See, then,

our predicament. We can think of matter only in terms of mind. We can think of mind only in terms of matter." I deny this, and should put it thus:—We can think of matter only *by acts* of mind. We can now think of mind only through the aid of matter, i.e. by a material organism furnishing the sensitive basis of thought.

He ends the paragraph, "The antithesis of subject and object, never to be transcended while consciousness lasts, renders impossible all knowledge of that Ultimate Reality in which subject and object are united." But I maintain their synthesis in the self-conscious Ego.

He concludes (p. 627, § 273) by saying that "it is one and the same Ultimate Reality which is manifested to us subjectively and objectively," its nature in either form being inscrutable, while its law—in the order of its manifestations—is the same in both. But this is a quite unwarrantable assertion. How can Mr. Spencer know that there are not two ultimates which harmonize together, or three ultimates—one the absolute cause of, yet ever distinct from, the other two, which two are respectively revealed to us as subjective and objective.

In this fifth part, then, he appears to me to fail (if the views here advocated are not erroneous) altogether in establishing the merely phenomenal nature of mind and matter and the explicability of mental phenomena in terms of matter and motion; although his account of the genesis of nervous structures of all degrees of complexity through physical agencies, and of the relations of sensitive functions to such structures, are most ingenious, instructive, and suggestive.

The contents of the three parts of his work here considered (the third, fourth, and fifth parts) may be summarized as follows:—

In these parts his object is to show that there is no hiatus, and that mental phenomena are essentially one with vital and with physical phenomena; that the law of mental states (i.e. their proportional persistence with objective incidences) is part of the general growing correspondence of inner and outer relations, which, again, is but a phase of the general physical principle that force follows the line of least resistance. Finally, he affirms that an inscrutable entity underlies the two unanalyzables—matter and mind.

Thus Part III. has been occupied with the essential (as asserted) similarity of life and mind, and with the way in which the highest phenomena of the latter arise and are developed without break from primitive, vital instability.

In Part IV. psychical changes have been represented as but relatively distinguished from physiological ones by their

more exclusive seriality, and the law of mind (association) has been represented as a sequence of the law of things, and as being the same, from reflex action up to the highest mental acts. Also that these powers and acts are due to the repetition of experiences which are accumulated, organized, and inherited. Thus, from another standpoint, he has denied that any hiatus exists.

In Part V. he has tried to show that mental acts are interpretable in terms of matter and motion; first, by a sketch of the genesis of nervous systems, and then by showing how the various functions, translated into mental states, harmonize with the physical conception—the whole ending in his one inscrutable entity.

The contents of those three parts (III., IV., and V.) may be still more shortly expressed thus:—There is nothing objective but matter and motion, redistributed, the correspondences between their distributions, known respectively as internal and external, being respectively life and mind, which are continuous without break up to the highest mental acts, and which all conform to one law of proportional coherence—all explicable by physical terms, which are again only thinkable in mental terms, the result being that we must admit the existence of an unknowable nexus, the cause of both, and of the whole continuous and unbroken process of evolution. This, it is here contended, has been by an elaborate examination shown not to be the case; the radical distinctness of intellectual from all other activity having been brought out all the more by Mr. Spencer's prolonged attempt to reduce it to essential similarity with and to express it in terms of physiological action, and also to explain it by matter and motion, as symbols of an unknowable unity.

The teaching, therefore, of the whole five parts which together form the first volume of the "Psychology," may be expressed as follows:—

I. Motion and feelings are parallelly correlated with nervous structure.

II. Nothing is knowable but feelings which we must take as symbols of the unknowable in the unanalysable forms—mind, matter, motion.

III. Mind is essentially the same as physiological activity.

IV. There is no hiatus between the lowest and the highest psychical activities—the latter being the former; reiterated, accumulated, organized, and inherited.

V. Mental phenomena may be interpreted in terms of matter and motion—the latter being but symbols of the one unknowable cause of both mind and matter.

Against all this it has been contended:—

I. Admitting that motion and feeling are parallelly correlated with nervous structure, yet care must be taken in considering the question to avoid (1) certain errors and inaccuracies of detail; (2) important beggings of the question as to the distinction between thought and feeling; (3) certain imperfections of analysis; and (4) a mode of treatment tending by implication to prejudice readers against truths not directly attacked. All these faults have been pointed out in detail.*

II. That *external things*, as well as feelings, are knowable, and that objective truth is revealed to us through the self-conscious *Ego*, which also shows us that there is an essential difference between mind and matter which are both known to us by powers resident in a body (our own) subject to the laws of matter, motion, and animality, but that mind is fundamentally different from brute neurosis. Also, that it is utterly gratuitous to assume one underlying base of which matter and mind are diverging forms.†

III. That though there is much analogy between mind and physical life, the distinctness which exists between life, sense, and intellect has been made specially plain by Mr. Spencer's inability to demonstrate transitions between them without the silent introduction of those very higher powers the development of which to be explained.

IV. Mr. Spencer is only enabled to deny the existence of a hiatus between the lower and higher powers by ignoring memory, reason, and will, as known to us by our reflective self-consciousness in its highest states of intellectual activity.

V. Mental phenomena cannot really be interpreted in terms of matter and motion, though they cannot be experienced by us save through sensation, and the latter may be admitted to be a function of animated matter.

This first volume therefore, full as it is of ingenious and suggestive physiological thoughts, and admirable as a thesaurus of explanations of brute psychisms, leaves the arguments for the radical distinctness of intellect from sensation, not only unimpaired but reinforced.

M.

* DUBLIN REVIEW, for October, 1874, pp. 478, 496.

† DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1874, pp. 496, 508, and for July, 1875.

APPENDIX TO THE FIRST ARTICLE OF OUR JANUARY NUMBER.

SINCE our last number appeared, a paper has been published in the "Tablet" of March 17, which, to our mind, expresses with admirable force an important portion of the true doctrine on civil intolerance. We are very desirous of placing this paper on more permanent record, and we are sure that our readers will thank us for doing so.

From what has been said, and yet more from what has been implied in the preceding articles, we may gather the description of that *protective* intolerance which the Catholic Church does not refuse to sanction; nay, which at her bidding the civil authorities have from time to time put in practice. It is an intolerance which supposes that true religious doctrine must count amongst the chief goods of civilization; that Providence has instituted the social order of the State, as for other ends, for this also, that it may help to preserve and perpetuate the tradition of the truth; it supposes that individuals are answerable often for the religious and moral doctrines which they have cast aside or refused, inasmuch as the loss to them has arisen out of their own malignity and stubbornness. National unity of true religious belief is a blessing beyond all price; and those who endeavour to violate or endanger it, are guilty of treason to the State no less than to the Church. But, as we have pointed out, the enactment of laws intended to protect this unity must take place under two special conditions: the first, that the creed protected be certainly known for the truth; the second, that the need of repressive measures be fully made out. These are special conditions. But there are other and general conditions required for the valid enactment of laws generally: amongst which the most important for our present consideration is, that there be a reasonable probability of successfully carrying out what is determined upon, so as not to incur thereby a greater injury to the State than that which calls for the ruler's interference. The law must not be a dead letter from the beginning; neither is it allowable to cure one evil by causing a worse. With these precautions, and under these provisions, we say that the civil repression of errors in matter of religion not only is lawful, but may be obligatory. And as it frequently falls out that not the whole Catholic truth, but a larger or smaller part of it only is held by this society or that,—how far protective intolerance in a given example should be insisted upon and where it ceases to be lawful, are particular cases, which admit of a great deal of dispute, and will be differently decided by different persons.

But, besides protective intolerance, another kind is well known to history, and this for distinction's sake we will call the *aggressive* species. As a definition of it seems difficult to frame, let us try to explain what we mean by a typical instance or two. Lecky in his "History of Rationalism"

(vol. ii., p. 45) observes that: "When the Reformation triumphed in Scotland, [*id est*, when it had seized the supreme power,] one of its first fruits was a law prohibiting any priest from celebrating, or any worshipper from hearing Mass, under pain of the confiscation of his goods for the first offence, of exile for the second, and of death for the third." Again (p. 43): "In Ireland the religion of the immense majority of the people was banned and proscribed, and when in 1626 the Government manifested some slight wish to grant it partial relief, nearly all the Irish Protestant Bishops, under the presidency of Usher, assembled to protest in a solemn resolution against the indulgence." Here are some characteristic notes of that *aggressive* intolerance, which is more usually, and with great propriety of speech, entitled "persecution." It consists, we would say, in the application of physical or brute force to those who have never held a given religious doctrine, for the purpose of inducing them to embrace it: such persons being adult and enjoying the ordinary use of reason, and having contracted no obligation towards the faith from which they dissent. They are, for example (to make our last expression quite clear) hereditary non-Catholics or hereditary non-Protestants, and still force is brought to bear upon them as means to their conversion. Protective intolerance was, in its end, defensive, or, at any rate, was an exercise of *justitia vindicativa*, a punishing of apostates and rebels. Aggressive intolerance, on the contrary, is an act of conquest, directly intended to win over those whom peaceable arguments cannot persuade. It is coercion employed to effect conversion, not to bring back, but to create religious unity.

Of this we say that, considering the human character and dispositions, its dignity at once and its weakness, its natural way of arriving at the truth, and the peculiarities of its relation to divine or revealed dogmas; considering likewise Who was the Founder of the Christian religion, and what was the manner of His preaching while on earth, there can be no doubt that it is unlawful, cruel, and pernicious. Whether, under any conceivable circumstances, it might be lawful, is no question for practical politics, nor, we may add, for human ethics. The chimeras of speculation are best let alone, when we have to deal with what has already come to pass, and is likely to happen again. Taking human nature as it is,—amenable to law and reason,—we say broadly and frankly that aggressive intolerance or persecution is a crime, and merits our deep reprobation.

Will it surprise any one if we go on to deny that the Catholic Church has set the seal of her infallible authority to a single document which would justify this kind of intolerance? We do deny it, however. We think that 1,800 years are a warrant for our saying that the Church has permitted coercive measures only in defence of a civilization and polity which had legitimately established themselves, or in punishment of those who had broken solemn engagements by apostasy from the truth. And should Protestants object that it was not the truth which Catholic States acknowledged and upheld, we answer easily that even if there were such an error of fact, the principle of protection itself remains essentially unaltered. Errors of fact do not take away the law or diminish its validity. But as we deny that persecution is Catholic or Roman, so we affirm that

the Protestant churches generally have stained themselves with the guilt of it in its most odious form. This proposition of ours may stand once more in the words of Lecky when he says (vol. ii., p. 49) that, excepting Zuinglius and Socinus, "all the most eminent Reformers advocated persecution, and in nearly every country where their boasted Reformation triumphed, the result is to be mainly attributed to coercion." Early Protestantism bears a curious likeness to the religion of Mahomet, both in its nature and in the mode of its propagation. Where it conquered at all it did so by the sword of a prophet such as John Knox, or of a Khalif, a Commander of the Faithful such as Henry VIII.

Our limits do not permit us to handle, as we should like, so wide and exhaustive a theme. At the most, we can only intimate what are the lines upon which the arguments for its various portions should be constructed. First, then, it would require to be shown (and, undoubtedly, materials are here very abundant) that the Catholic Church has made her conquests all over Europe and in the other continents by the preaching of the Gospel, and not by threatening with the sword those unconverted heathen or infidels who were slow to attend at her summons. "*Domuit orbem non ferro, sed ligno;*" the cross of Christ is that which overcame, and there was no carnal weapon in the hands of Catholic missionaries, as now there is none. History, even when narrated by those who would extinguish for ever the miraculous power, the influence, wheresoever it penetrates, of Christianity, refuses to say that the Church grew strong by violence, or began her reign as earthly victors are wont by setting her feet on the necks of the vanquished. "The mighty morn was gathering light" from Tiberius to Constantine, and commotion there was none perceptible; afterwards noon-day spread over east and west and beyond their confines, but still without tumult of war against those who were never subject. Between the fifth and the eleventh century modern Europe was gradually forming, the races were drawn to Christianity which had broken to pieces the great Empire, and others, north and west, as they came flocking to the Rhine and the Seine, or where they dwelt in their own territories, heard the voice of the Roman Church, and submitted to her. There is no page so fair and illuminated in all her history as that which tells how the Franks and the English and the Irish, and after them, the Teutons and Normans and Russians, and with these the Hungarians and the people along the Danube, and those who had relapsed into Paganism in Southern Europe, were made to feel the presence of a spiritual power in their midst, and brought to understand its claims upon their daily life and actions. We do not say that violence never laid a hand on these barbarians; Charlemagne, may even the apostolic King of Hungary, S. Stephen, was occasionally less like S. Boniface and S. Columbanus than their mission would have given us leave to suppose. But, if they fell short in this of the Gospel pattern—which, indeed, cannot be altogether affirmed, since we know that those refractory Saxons and Hungarians, as many as happened to be such, were not simply misbelievers, but lawless and uncivilized, more like wild beasts than men, and needing that some one should strike fear into them and tame them a little—in any case, the Roman Church was in spirit, quite as certainly as in doctrine, the enemy of brute force, and

would have the Gospel preached as Our Lord and his Apostles had preached it at the beginning. In fact, an attentive reader of history will perceive that so far back as Charlemagne the Church had to be on her guard against the imperfect Christianity of the civil authorities. The State is converted last of all from its natural pride and independence; the conversion is hard to make and hard to keep, for it is here that the unregenerate man displays his worst qualities. If we desire to know what is Catholic teaching in the matter of persecution, we must look to the spiritual guides and masters in the Church, to missionary saints and the Fathers. But, as we have said, there might be grave injustice in allowing that certain mediæval kings forgot the spirit of Christianity in their zeal for the Faith. We are all at liberty to think what we please, but it is evident that the heathen Danes and Northmen for a long time were destitute of human feeling, and were no better than wolves. Yet, on the whole, they put off their nature and allowed themselves to be led captive by unarmed missionaries, who could use only persuasion towards them. And so, though we may find some difficulty in separating the work of conversion from the ordinary and necessary exercise of force to put down immoral barbarism, it is still historically true that preaching was the universal instrument of the change which has given us a new European world. S. Gregory VII., looking across the centuries to his august predecessor, S. Leo the Great, could still repeat the significant words, "*Domuit orbem non ferro sed ligno.*" It has not been otherwise since his day. America was discovered, China and Japan were opened up to the Jesuits, the Islands of the Indian Ocean and the Pacific were occupied by colonies from the nations which Rome had made Christian, and so far as the Church could get an influence or a hearing, it was ever the maxim that those who bear the Gospel are and must be heralds of peace. This, too, we may learn in hostile writers. Nor will it be imagined for an instant, that the Roman Church approved of those diabolical outrages which so-called Christians, ruffianly men of no conscience and hardly any creed, allowed themselves to perpetrate on the American Indians, or on other defenceless natives of the freshly-known regions. Whoever feels inclined to make of *that* a charge against the Faith, and to say it came of our unyielding intolerance, let him study the lives of Las Casas and S. Francis Xavier, or of the glorious F. Anchieta and those never-to-be-forgotten heroes of the Society of Jesus who an "Eden built in the waste wilderness," and have thrown around the name of Paraguay an enchantment which ought to charm into silence even the enemies of the Catholic Church. What was the common doctrine of all the Fathers, from Tertullian to S. Gregory I., has also been the practice of all who received a commission to go forth and make disciples for Christ. They were to persuade, not to force; to entreat and convince, not to menace with temporary pains; they could not be true preachers unless their sweetness and patience were at least equal to the ardour of their belief. When we say this we are giving the sum of many chapters, and the spirit of a thousand episodes, of the world's history. It is not on this score that the church need fear investigation.

PIUS IX. ON LIBERAL CATHOLICISM.

IN our number for last April we cited various utterances of Pius IX., comprised within the space of hardly more than a year, declaring how opposed to the teaching of the Holy See are the doctrines of so-called "Liberal Catholicism." We are indebted to the "Civiltà Cattolica" for a knowledge of one or two similar declarations, which the Holy Father has issued quite lately.

We begin with a Brief addressed by him to the Bishop of Three Rivers, in Canada :—

"We must praise the zeal with which you have endeavoured to fore-arm your people against the crafty wiles of so-called Catholic Liberalism : which are all the more dangerous inasmuch as under an outward appearance of piety they lead into error many well-meaning men ; and inasmuch as—by drawing them away from sound doctrine, especially in questions which at first sight seem to concern the civil rather than the ecclesiastical power—they weaken faith, disturb unity, divide the forces of Catholicity, and furnish most efficient aid to the enemies of the Church, who teach the same errors."

On December 11th of last year the Pope thus spoke in a Brief addressed to the Editor of a journal called "Il Popolo," published at Rodez :—

"We cannot but approve the circumstance, that you have undertaken to defend and explain the judgments of Our Syllabus, especially in opposition to what is called Catholic Liberalism."*

Nor can any one fairly doubt, that a similar reference to Liberal Catholicism is intended in the Brief of Commendation, which the Pope has so recently issued to the "Osservatore Cattolico" of Milan :—

"We exhort you (he says) that disregarding such adverse feeling and other annoyances as may meet you in your path, you continue to set forth and explain the teachings of this Holy See, for the sake of homage to the truth and utility to your neighbours."†

* "Nequimus non probare vos Syllabi Nostri sententias propugnandas explicandasque suscepisse, præsertim adversus Liberalismum quem dicunt Catholicum." Our readers will observe the phrase "*Our Syllabus*."

† "Vos hortamur ut, posthabitis offensionibus et molestiis occurrentibus, documenta hujus Sanctæ Sedis, tradere et explicare pergatis in veritatis obsequium et proximorum utilitatem."

Notices of Books.

The True Story of the Vatican Council. By Cardinal MANNING. Parts 1 and 2. (The "Nineteenth Century" for March and April, 1877). London: H. S. King.

IT is one of the special features of the periodical literature of the present day that certain reviews have established a sort of literary platform, where men of all opinions may set forth their views upon every conceivable subject. It is, of course, assumed at the outset that the Editor in no way identifies himself with the opinions expressed by his correspondents, he merely answers for their capacity to deal from their own point of view with the subject they have selected. He leads them upon the platform, puts them before their audience, and then his part in the matter ends. To this class of reviewers the "Nineteenth Century" belongs. It has no programme further than to be for men of various minds a medium of communication with the public. The exponents of belief and scepticism appear side by side in its pages. As the Laureate well says in his beautiful prefatory sonnet, the writers are "of diverse tongue":—

For some, descending from the sacred peak
Of hoar high-templed Faith, have leagued again
Their lot with ours to roam the world about:
And some are wilder comrades, sworn to seek
If any golden harbour be for men
In seas of Death and sunless gulfs of Doubt.

One fortunate result of this practice is, that such reviews as the "Contemporary" and the "Nineteenth Century" in the carrying out of their programme give to eminent Catholic writers an opportunity of directly addressing their non-Catholic fellow countrymen on some of the most momentous subjects of the day. Twenty years ago no such facilities existed. Catholic papers and periodicals were almost entirely read by Catholics only, and the non-Catholic reviews would not open their pages to the work of Catholic pens writing on Catholic subjects. But the advent of magazines like the "Nineteenth Century" has given to Catholic writers a new means of access to the general public. The mere fact that such a review had no special programme of principles would not have been sufficient to admit into it articles written in a Catholic sense were it not for the position which the Catholic Church and its leading members have obtained in England. In this respect, therefore, we may regard the appearance of Catholic articles in non-Catholic periodicals at various times during the last ten years as a satisfactory indication of progress.

Few papers, if any, in the "Nineteenth Century" will be read with such interest as Cardinal Manning's articles on the "True Story of the Vatican Council." On this subject no one could speak with higher authority than his Eminence, not only on account of the part which he took in its proceedings, but also from the fact that he has followed the controversies which have arisen in consequence of it, and has from the first been among the foremost in defending its authority and setting forth its decisions. In the pages of this new periodical he gives us the two opening chapters of the first history of the Council which has appeared in the English language. We say the first advisedly, for no one can give the honourable name of history to the highly-coloured narratives which appeared in the press, and in pamphlets and such volumes as the English version of Pomponio Leto. Cardinal Manning's narrative has not yet reached the actual opening of the council. He is still dealing with the preparation for its convocation, but already we can see that the narrative will be, not a series of clever magazine articles, but a remarkable contribution to the English historical literature of the day. We trust, and we have little doubt, that when the "story" is complete it will be reprinted as an independent volume. As such, it would find a place on the shelves of nearly every library in England.

Cardinal Manning's narrative of the proceedings preliminary to the assemblies of the Council is based upon what we may call the first part of the official history of the Vatican Council, the *Storia del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano scritta sui Documenti Originali*, the work of Mgr.-Ceconi, Archbishop of Florence, undertaken by him at the express desire of the Pope. It traces the history of the Council from the 6th of December, 1864, when Pius IX. in a secret session of the Congregation of Rites, asked the Cardinals to give their opinions upon the desirability or otherwise of assembling a Council. No less than five years were spent in deliberating upon the convocation of the Council, and making preparation for its assembling. There was no hurry, no precipitation. Rome, as a great French orator once said, is patient as eternity. And this patient preparation for the Council is the best refutation of the popular fallacy that it was a kind of ecclesiastical *coup d'état*, conceived and executed to meet the exigencies of the moment. Again, it is generally supposed that the Council was convoked to define Papal Infallibility—this is the burden of all that has been written against it by the Dollingerites. None but the most blindly bigoted adherents of this theory can read Cardinal Manning's calm judicial statement of the actual facts of the convocation without seeing how utterly baseless is the idea. The statement is so concise and condensed that it would be hopeless to attempt to give an abstract of it here, but there is no need of our doing so. In this point of view we would especially direct attention to the second article, which brings out very clearly the bearing of the whole pontificate of Pius IX. upon the definition, and shows how it was the natural sequence of the events of 1854, of 1862, and of 1867. In the first of these years, 206 cardinals and bishops assembled for the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception; the year 1862 saw 265 bishops assisting at the canonization of the martyrs of Japan; in

1867 no less than 500 bishops assembled in Rome for the centenary of S. Peter. "No pontiff," says the Cardinal, "from the beginning, in all the previous succession of 256 popes, has ever so united the bishops with himself."* In those three great assemblies there was a "more than implicit" acknowledgment of the infallibility of the successor of S. Peter. In 1854, the bishops met to hear a dogma defined by his authority without a Council. In 1862, the bishops in their declaration of June 8th, addressed to the Pope, spoke in no uncertain words. "You are to us," they said, "the teacher of sound doctrine, the centre of unity, the unfailing light to the nations kindled by divine wisdom. You are the Rock, the foundation of the Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. When you speak, we hear Peter's voice; when you decide, we obey the authority of Christ." Again, in 1867, on the occasion of the centenary, the 500 assembled bishops made as ample a declaration, accepting all the doctrinal acts of the long pontificate of Pius IX., and proclaiming that "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Pius." The full importance of this declaration will only be understood by taking into account the circumstances under which it was drawn up and adopted. These are set forth at pp. 182—184 of the Cardinal's second article, and they make it quite clear that the bishops clearly recognized the bearing of their words upon the question of infallibility, and intended that they should convey the meaning here assigned to them. The history, therefore, of the events of 1854, 1862, and 1867, is a necessary prelude to that of the Vatican Council. The Council defined Papal infallibility, though it was convoked for no such purpose. And it is a fact that the chief agents in forcing the question upon the Council were not the Jesuits, or the members of the Curia, to whom it is popularly attributed, but on the contrary, the active propagandists of that party which, with its centre at Munich, and its branches scattered over Europe, was actively engaged from 1867 to 1869 in disseminating misrepresentations of history, and publishing attacks upon the authority of the Holy See. This is the inference which we draw from Cardinal Manning's narrative, and we believe it is inevitable. As his Eminence says, the action of this party "insured the proposing and passing of the definition. It was seen at once that not only the truth of a doctrine, but the independence of the Church was at stake."

Elaborate precautions were taken by the preliminary commission that drew up the rules for the procedure of the Council to secure full discussion of, and perfect freedom of debate upon, all matters brought before it. Finally, six schemata were prepared which contained the subjects of discussion. In preparing the second schema, that "upon the Church of Christ," the commission came to the question of Papal Infallibility in its session of February 11th, 1869. Two questions were proposed—(1) Whether it *could*

* A favourite idea of the English no-Popery school used to be (and perhaps still is), that the steam-engine and the telegraph wire were among the modern agencies of which the Catholic Church had reason to be afraid. Without these powerful auxiliaries the four great meetings of bishops in Rome in 1854, 1862, 1867, and 1869-70, would have been impossible, for whole provinces would have been for years without their bishops.

be defined? (2) Whether it *ought* to be defined? On the first question the commission was unanimous. on the second all but one (an inopportunist) concurred in deciding that it ought not to be proposed to the Council, except on the demand of the bishops. Thus the subject of Papal Infallibility was not mentioned in the schema.

"Two observations, says the Cardinal, "may be made on these facts. The first is, that now, for a second time, when the subject of infallibility would, according to the adversaries of the Council, be expected to take the first place, it was deliberately set aside. The second observation is, that Pius the Ninth had neither desire nor need to propose the defining of his infallibility. Like all his predecessors he was conscious of the plenitude of his primacy. He had exercised it in the full assurance that the faith of Christendom responded to his unerring authority: he felt no need of any definition. It was not the head of the Church, nor the Church at large, that needed this definition. The bishops in 1854, 1862, 1867, had amply declared it. It was the small number of disputants who doubted, and the still smaller number who denied, that the head of the Church can neither err in faith and morals, nor lead into error the Church of which he is the supreme teacher, that needed an authoritative declaration of the truth."

These words sum up the whole question, and in them we have the key to the true story of the Vatican Council. We have therefore cited them at length. We look forward with eager anticipation to the further articles of the series. We commend them to the attention and the careful study of all Catholics who wish to have an intelligent appreciation of the course of events which led up to the most important act of the Church in our day.

The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves. Third Series. Edited by JOHN MORRIS, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Burns & Oates. 1877.

THERE is little need to say that the third series of F. Morris's course will be welcomed by a large community of readers and men of letters. The intrinsic value of these genuine records, and the care and consummate skill with which they are put together lie quite apart from their interest as narratives; and whereas, as these can be appreciated by even surface readers, the cost of their production can perhaps only be estimated by those who have been in some degree accustomed to the arrangement and choice of a heterogeneous mass of records. The present and third volume of the "Troubles," as F. Morris says in his preface, will share the interest of the first, as it relates chiefly to one time and place, that place being, moreover, the beautiful and historical city of York. It is perhaps well that F. Morris, also in his preface, and referring to the Yorkshire Recusant's narrative, warns his readers that "canny Yorkshire" has an uncommonly rough side to its tongue. We are glad to

find that at last some vivid and actual knowledge is afforded to the world in general of the condition of the prisons in which Catholics were confined for conscience' sake by those whose outcry against Spain and the Inquisition was the loudest. For instance, that of the Ouse Bridge Kidcote in York, in which "air, light, and ventilation were absent, and the waters of the river rushed in when they were above their usual level," which, be it observed, has always been, as now, a matter of continual recurrence. The present volume of "Troubles" contains:—1, "An Ancient Editor's Notebook." 2, "A Yorkshire Recusant's Relation." 3, "Father Richard Holtby on Persecution in the North." 5, "Mr. John Mush's Life of Margaret Clitherow." 6, "Father Pollard's Recollections of the Yorkshire Mission." The "Ancient Editor"—so called by F. Morris—F. Christopher Green, or Grene, was the English Penitentiary, first at Loretto and then at S. Peter's in Rome, where he lived and died at the English College. He was there a chief means of garnering up the records of the English martyrs, and handing them on to the present time. They were distributed by him in volumes, lettered and kept in "a cubbard" in the English College in Rome, then belonging to the Jesuits. These volumes are now widely scattered, some at Stonyhurst, one in Cardinal Manning's library in London, one at Oscott College, one (the worst cared-for of all) at Brussels, some broken up and lost, and one still remaining in the English College at Rome. The "Notebook" given by F. Morris is from the Oscott volume, lent for the purpose by Dr. Northcote, and its simple and homely testimony pours a great light upon the varieties of cruelty inflicted and borne by all classes for the true faith in the sixteenth century. For instance, two girls were put into the famous Little Ease at York on the evidence of a child of eight years old, and kept for eleven weeks in a noisome hole "full of toads and serpents," being fed during the time on a daily halfpennyworth of bread and water. A gentleman and his wife were imprisoned for six months for being said to have an altar-stone in the house. And a poor man in Durham was made to pay two shillings merely for having a cross marked on his linen. As to the vexations practised wantonly, and at the instance of any malicious person, upon Catholics at liberty, they are too numerous to relate. Houses were searched, aged people so frightened and ill-treated that they died in consequence, and the inmates carried off to prison or amerced in large fines on any or no evidence at all. Catholics were universally known as "traitors," and as such were "denounced" at any or every body's will, on such ridiculous charges as having set fire to houses in London, "walked with a Spaniard," or "raised sedition." Poor labourers were stripped of their cattle, goods, clothes, and every scrap of food in their houses for not attending "Divine Service" on Sundays; while richer men were robbed of whole estates, which were begged by rapacious men as "recusants' property. The pursuivants, a class of bandits whose relentless and heartless rapacity we are scarcely able to realise, were allowed to break open desks, chests, and coffers of every kind in "suspected" houses, and to carry off whatever jewels, plate, papers, or deeds they chose. It can be

easily imagined that these men scarcely ever restored their prey without extorting large sums of money in return.

F. Richard Holby's account of the persecutions of Catholics in the north of England is well worth a study. He was made Superior of the Jesuits' Scotch College at Pont-à-Mousson in 1587, was sent to England by the General of the Society (Aquaviva) in 1589, and from that year to 1640, when he died, he laboured uninterruptedly in the English province. In all those fifty-one years F. Holby was never once arrested, nor suffered a single day's illness. The multiplication of cruelty in the robberies, wanton waste, and insults showered upon Catholics in the sixteenth century, which were to many of them worse than the fear of death or imprisonment, are thoroughly laid open in F. Holby's account. It becomes abundantly evident how England lost the faith, when we watch in these annals the well-planned and consistent policy of Elizabeth in stamping it out. Family by family, man by man, the Catholics of the North were marked down and followed, exactly as the "great game" is now marked and followed by keen sportsmen in African wilds and Indian jungles. Pursuivants and servitors, soldiers and constables, and a still more formidable array of treacherous, bribed, local informers, dogged their steps and noted their acts at home and abroad, until in many unhappy cases priests gave in and were "sworn" (to the Oath of Supremacy), and laymen surrendered to preserve some remnant of property, and prospects, and their lives. The true marvel is, as F. Morris observes, how anything like the true faith can remain, as it has, firmly rooted in Lancashire and Yorkshire, where this worse than Diocletian persecution most hotly raged. How some of these northern Catholics died, F. Holby's narrative of "Three Martyrs" sufficiently shows. The pearl of the whole volume, to our mind, is Mr. Mush's Life of Margaret Clitherow, the martyr of well-known fame. In this portion of his volume, F. Morris has made valuable and excellent use of the House books of York, a city which ought to be sacred to all Catholics from the multitude of martyrdoms and the abounding confessorships which enrich its annals. In "A Yorkshire Recusant's Relation" it is said that the body of Margaret Clitherow remained six weeks buried without corrupting, and when afterwards the remains had been secretly carried away by some Catholics, they remained again for six days unembalmed after a long journey, and still presented no signs of decay. One of the martyr's hands is preserved as a most precious relic in the convent at Micklegate Bar, in York. The one blot in the Yorkshire Recusant's account, and in some degree in that of Margaret Clitherow's martyrdom, is the violent intemperance of open-mouthed invective which was a curious feature of the times. F. Morris has, as usual, enriched his various narratives with lucid explanations, and copious and carefully accurate notes.

Review of Montalembert's Posthumous Volumes. By Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. ("Month," April, 1877). London: Burns & Oates.

THIS is a very interesting and appreciative comment on Montalembert's volumes. The following remarks are so just in themselves and so manifoldly important in their bearing on present circumstances, that we are sure our readers will thank us for transferring them to our pages.

"While dwelling with enthusiasm on these and other services which the religious orders rendered to society, M. de Montalembert does not forget that it was not on account of their usefulness alone, or even chiefly, that they were held so dear by the Catholics of those ages. The monastic life was not in honour because monks took the lead in every movement for the advance of legitimate liberties, for the cultivation of literature, and the fine and useful arts. The debt which society owed to them was freely acknowledged, but if it had not existed, the devotion of the faithful would still have seen in the monks the representatives of all that is purest and most sublime in the Gospel itself. It was clearly understood then, as it is clearly understood now, that the religious principle is of the very essence of Christianity, inasmuch as without that principle, there would be wanting in the Church the visible and permanent embodiment of the highest teaching of our Lord, the professed observation of the evangelical counsels, the imitation of the poverty, the purity, the obedience, the utter abandonment even of the lawful affections and enjoyments of human existence, of which He Himself was the first great example. The practice of evangelical perfection could not be carried out, indeed, without producing as its natural and legitimate result the immense social benefits of which we have so many conspicuous instances in the history of the Middle Ages. But the necessity of the principle is independent of those results.

"If it is well sometimes to remind ourselves of this truth of the essential importance of the religious life in the Christian scheme, it is not less useful to bear in mind the other great truth which may be said to be the burthen of the whole teaching of the history of that period of the life of the Church with which the volumes now before us are concerned, and on which M. de Montalembert especially insists. The history of the Church contains more than one very dark epoch. The world and the powers of evil are always howling around her, and they never approach more nearly to that triumph over her which they are never permitted to gain, than when they are able to some extent to invade the sanctuary itself, and corrupt by avarice or sensuality those who ought to set the purest example of every most sublime virtue. It is in times of scandal and rebuke that the children of religious institutes have often had to appear as the great reserves of the army of the Church. Sometimes they have come forth almost in troops from the desert or the cloister, when some great Christian doctrine has been in danger. At other times, as in the age of which we are now speaking, a succession of strong spirits, trained in the unworldly atmosphere of the religious life, have been called to fill the highest places in the government of the Church, when she has had to undertake some great conflict with the power of the State, in defence of her own liberties, or to secure her children against the intrusion of corrupt pastors, the wolves in sheep's clothing of whom our Lord speaks in the Sermon on the Mount. The particular dangers and trials of the Church change from age to age, they may never repeat themselves in every detail, though there is

nevertheless so much general sameness about the attacks with which the powers of evil vent their malice against the Spouse of Christ. What never changes is that malice itself, and the perseverance with which the warfare is waged, generation after generation. Thus the day is never likely to dawn when the Church will not need the assistance which, in the age of Gregory the Seventh, she derived from the noble series of monastic Pontiffs of whom M. de Montalembert has given us so interesting a sketch in these last volumes of the work by which, more perhaps than any other of his writings, he will be known to posterity. The great increase of clerks regular, which has been so marked a feature in the history of the post-Reformation period, as well as the elevation of the secular clergy, which dates from the labours of the Council of Trent, and is connected with the great names of St. Charles Borromeo, St. Vincent of Paul, and so many others only less illustrious, has immensely diminished the separation which formerly existed between the religious orders and the parochial pastors. In many respects the training of each is almost identical, while rivalries and differences are soon forgotten in the face of common dangers and common enterprises for the glory of God, which are enough to tax to the utmost the energies of all. Thus there is never likely to be a time when the active work which is so generally performed by the members of religious orders in the Church, can be dispensed with. There is never likely to be a time, when, in her greatest emergencies, the Church will not look to them for services which they alone can render. But, even if the case were otherwise, they would still hold their own proper and peculiar place in her system, as in the counsels of her Lord and Founder. Her vigour and her beauty, the perfection and essential completeness of her life, would be wanting without them."

Switzerland in 1876; a Lecture read in the Assembly Rooms, Bath, January 24th, 1877. By the Very Rev. J. N. SWEENEY, O.S.B., D.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1877.

WE can scarcely say that this lecture is interesting, because interest is too cold a word to be applied to news of the sufferings of the Church in one land communicated to its members in another. When the persecution in Switzerland was at its height very little was known of it in England; and now, while it still continues with but little abatement, we are only beginning to hear detailed reports, to learn the amount of hardship and wrong and of personal suffering inflicted, not only on a religious body, but on individuals, to see published the inconsistent and unreasonable course of action adopted by Governments which by their very nature profess to uphold Republican freedom and equality.

In the summer of last year (1876) Dr. Sweeney made a visit to Switzerland, and during a short stay at Lucerne, heard from the lips of Mgr. Lachat and some of his clergy most of the facts which are here published. He, therefore, tells us only of that part of the persecution in which Mgr. Lachat was the central figure. This truly great and much tried man has for his diocese several cantons of the north-west of Switzerland, amongst which is the canton of Berne, which includes the mountain district called the Jura. Most of the population of that part of the country is Pro-

testant ; he has, however, three Catholic cantons, and the Bernese Jura is almost wholly Catholic. The constancy of the clergy and people of that district, the Jura, is worthy of all admiration, for we must bear in mind that at different times for nearly fifty years they have had to stand against the infringement of their rights, and the consequent want of facilities for education and the practice of religion. Moreover, the whole of the persecution of the Jurassiens is unjust, not only before God, but before men, because it is contrary to a treaty into which the Bernese Government freely entered. At the time of the French Revolution the Jura was seized by France. By the Treaty of Vienna, in 1815, it was given back to Switzerland, becoming part of the canton of Berne, *on condition* that the people (who were thoroughly French in feeling as well as in language and habits, while those of Berne were German) should be always free to exercise their religion. Fifteen years passed, and the treaty was broken. Laws were framed contrary to the Catholic spirit, and when the clergy refused to swear fealty to them their stipends were stopped. A little later Catholic education was assailed, infidel professors were forced into the schools ; the Ursuline nuns were expelled, because the education of many of the future women of the province was in their hands ; and the noble Sisters of Charity, whom even the godless have revered, were likewise driven away. From 1849 to 1859 there was comparatively a time of peace. Then a law was passed making education gratuitous, compulsory, and secular ; and another authorizing the people to choose their own *curés*—a doubtful privilege, which was not accepted, even in one single instance. They stood faithful, while the Government with subtle craft tried to weaken the two points in which lay the strength of their faith,—the Catholic education of their children, and allegiance to their bishop.

At the time of the Vatican Council Mgr. Lachat was an earnest upholder of Papal infallibility, and on returning to his diocese he published the decrees, and brought down upon himself the wrath of the governing body at Berne. Having suppressed his seminary in his absence, they now declared his deposition, forbade him to exercise in any way the authority and privileges of a bishop, and ordered the clergy and people not to obey him. But these commands fell upon the faithful like so much rain upon a rock. Again, the district of the Jura distinguished itself by its loyalty and by the troubles into which it was plunged. The ninety-seven priests—every priest of the Jura to a man—protested that they would be faithful to their bishop, if necessary, even to death. The Pope sent him a gold crozier set with diamonds, and a letter expressing warm sympathy, and congratulating him on his firmness. Other letters arrived from the bishops of France and Belgium. And when the action of the Government became more definite and aggressive, and the clergy of the Jura were declared to be suspended, large pilgrimages, the population of whole villages, wound their way in the depth of winter for many miles through the rugged mountain country to pray at holy shrines for peace and for that constancy which, as the event proved, was granted to them in an especial and admirable degree. But the persecution was carried much farther. On April 16th, 1873, Mgr. Lachat was expelled from his episcopal palace at

Soleure, after taking a sad farewell of his cathedral, and prostrating himself before its altars. He went to live on the little hill of Musseg, outside Lucerne, and there the author of the lecture and pamphlet saw him last summer, and heard from him the tale of his sorrows and those of his clergy and people. From England, from France, and from distant America, letters of sympathy had reached that quiet home, near Lucerne.

Still darker days came. The Bernese Government forbade the clergy to exercise any ecclesiastical function, and ordered the churches to be closed, though many of them had been built without Government aid, solely by the offerings of the faithful. At the desire of the Holy See, Mgr. Lachat gave authority to the priests to do what they could for the people by saying Mass in barns and outhouses, or other secret places, and carrying the Blessed Sacrament with them in their flight or wherever they were concealed. At the same time the Government invited whatever unhappy men they could find, apostates or suspended priests, to come and take the churches and accept large stipends. There is a touching account given of the last Mass before the arrival of one of these State *curés*.

"In one town, Porrentruy, before the arrival of one of these unhappy hirelings to occupy the church, the good old *curé* called the people together to hear Mass for the last time in the parish church, a place so dear to them. A large crowd of adorers attended, and at the end of Mass, seeing the impossibility of conveying away the Blessed Sacrament to a place of safety, as the gendarmes were guarding the doors, the celebrant opened the Tabernacle, consumed the sacred Hosts remaining in the ciborium, extinguished the lamp of the sanctuary, and retired. The world has experienced many bitter farewells, but has it ever experienced one more bitter than the farewell of the Blessed Sacrament and the clergy to a consecrated church! The following Sunday was the Feast of the Dedication of the church? Not there, but in a barn outside the town, 4,000 Catholics assembled to hear Mass. A table served as an altar, and the only decoration was a white sheet nailed against the wall to serve as a *reredos*."

Everywhere the people adhered to their lawful pastors; and, seeing that Mass was still celebrated by them, the Government tried to shake their firmness by fines and imprisonment. The *gendarme* who brought a priest to trial received one-third of the fine, but the penalty was generally imprisonment, because the priests, being reduced to poverty by the stoppage of their stipends, could not possibly pay the required amount. But all these measures failing, a decree of banishment was passed against the ninety-seven priests—the whole of the clergy of the Jura. This was at the end of January, 1874. Ten of the priests, through sickness or old age, were unable to go. These were strictly ordered, under penalty, not to say a word or do an act against the law. The other eighty-seven had to quit the country, and took refuge in France. Since then the voice of public indignation from other lands has forced the Government to allow them to return, but still the churches are held by apostates, and the faithful priests, though permitted to enter the country, are forbidden to exercise their ministry, under penalty of a fine equal to forty pounds, or a year's imprisonment. Some of them, as our author distinctly states, "died through privation." The rest, still striving to minister to the wants

of their flock, depend for subsistence on their bishop, Mgr. Lachat, who told his visitor from England that he had nearly a hundred priests thrown on his hands for whom he was "at a loss to find means of subsistence." It is for the benefit of these steadfast and still suffering confessors of the faith that Dr. Sweeney read and afterwards published his able lecture; and he states in his brief preface, dated from St. John's Priory, Bath, that if there are any who desire to give to so great a need he "will be proud and happy to forward to the good and brave bishop their sympathy and offerings."

It did not enter into the province of the giver of the lecture to speak of the persecution in other parts of Switzerland, but that "earthly paradise" of lake and mountain has become a place of trial as by fire for the Catholic portion of its population. We may instance Zurich, with its church seized by the Government and given up to the sacrilegious service of two apostates, while the faithful have had to erect a small plain building in the suburbs, and support by offerings their impoverished priests; Geneva, with its Bishop Mermillod still in exile on French territory; an unknown number of churches in other towns taken away from their lawful and orthodox priests, and the priests themselves deprived of all aid from Government—a wrong the extent and hardship of which we in England cannot realise.

Beside the account of the persecution, the lecture contains also the running narrative of a traveller. We may direct the attention of readers to its last part for a graphic and most interesting description of the great Benedictine abbey of Einsiedeln with its world-famed "Black Virgin."

The "New Republic"; or, Culture, Faith, and Philosophy, in an English Country House. London: Chatto & Windus.

THE great fault of this book is one of which the reviewer seldom has occasion to complain. It is almost too clever. There is not a page of its two volumes which does not sparkle with wit and epigram, and as one approaches the end, one is well nigh weary of the pyrotechnic display. It is, we take it, the author's first work. If so, we hail it, even more for its ample promise than for its brilliant performance.

The scene is laid in Otho Lawrence's "cool villa by the sea," a sybaritic habitation whither he has invited half-a-dozen friends to spend a quiet Sunday with him at the close of the London season. Otho Lawrence is as fortunate in his friends as he is "happy in this world's goods." Among them are two distinguished physicists, well known at the Royal Institution, who are here introduced under the names of Mr. Storks and Professor Stockton, an eminent poet and ex-professor of poetry, renowned as the apostle of culture, and evangelist of the gospel of "sweetness and light," whose real name is veiled under the very thin disguise of Mr. Luke; and the Rev. Dr. Jenkinson, "the great Broad Church divine, who thinks

that Christianity is not dead, but changed by himself and his followers in the twinkling of an eye," and in whom the judicious reader will hardly fail to recognize a well-known Oxford Professor and Head. Then there are Mr. Rose, poet and pre-Raphaelite, "who always speaks in an undertone, and whose two topics are self-indulgence and art"; "Mr. Saunders, from Oxford, very clever and advanced," and much occupied with the disproof of the existence of God; Donald Gordon, "who has deserted deer-stalking and the Kirk for literature and German metaphysics"; Mr. Herbert, Mr. Leslie, and Lord Allen, upon whose names and the interpretation thereof we must not linger. Among the ladies we have Miss Merton, "a Roman Catholic, a daughter of old Sir Ascot Merton, the horse-racing Evangelical"—"a young lady with large and rather sad-looking eyes, looking like a Reynolds' portrait—like a duchess of the last century"; Lady Ambrose, "a woman of very old but poor family, who has married a modern M.P. with more than a million of money," distinguished for "lovely large grey eyes," and inflexible rigidity of principle as to "knowing the right people"; and Mrs. Sinclair, who has published a volume of poems, and "is a sort of fashionable London Sappho."

Such are the *dramatis personæ*, and the two volumes before us are a record of two days of their talk. They begin with the dinner on Saturday evening, when not only is the "provision for the tongue as a tasting instrument" indicated by the accustomed *menu*, but there is a *menu* for the conversation too, it appearing to the cultivated host (as he explains) absurd to be so careful about what "we put into our mouths, and to leave to chance to arrange what comes out of them; to be so particular as to the order of what we eat, and to have no order at all in what we talk about." First on the card stood the "Aim of Life"; then "Town and Country," which was designed "to introduce a discussion as to where the aim of life was to be best attained. After this, by an easy transition, came 'Society'; next, by way of *entrées*, 'Art and Literature,' 'Love and Money,' 'Riches and Civilisation'; then 'The Present,' as something solid and satisfying; and lastly (a light superfluity to dally with, brightly coloured and unsubstantial), with the *entremets* came 'The Future.'" The conversation which ensues on these topics is, as might be expected, startling in the wide divergence of views which it represents. Thus one of the guests frankly confesses that he has been in a great many places, but not to pursue any end; only to forget that he has no end to pursue.

Mr. Saunders affirms that the end of life is "progress," which "according to all earnest thinkers," he explains, means "such progress as can be verified by statistics." Mr. Storks offers no opinion as to the end of life, but as to life itself he is quite clear that "it is matter, which under certain conditions, not yet fully understood, has become self-conscious." Mr. Luke, of course, sings the praises of "culture," and this he defines to consist in the union of two things—fastidious taste, and liberal sympathy, attainable only by wide reading, guided by sweet reason, which, when they are joined, enable us to discern the eternal and the absolutely righteous, wherever we find it. But we must refer our readers who desire to

partake of this feast of reason to the volumes before us. The chapter from which we have been quoting is particularly replete with good things; and its climax is very remarkable. Turning over the succeeding pages, we come upon Mr. Luke, reciting by the sea-shore some verses which are an excellent parody, if, indeed, they can be called a parody, of Matthew Arnold; and a little further on, we are treated to a sermon, by the Rev. Dr. Jenkinson, which is like one of Professor Jowett's discourses, seen through a magnifying glass. This sermon is really an admirable specimen of the homiletic performances of divines of the rationalistic school; and not less admirable is Mr. Stockton's comment upon the teaching of that school as "nothing more than a few fragments of science, imperfectly understood, obscured by a few fragments of Christianity imperfectly remembered;" or, Mr. Herbert's judgment, that it "is simply our modern Atheism trying to hide its own nakedness for the benefit of the more prudish part of the public, in the cast grave-clothes of Christ, who, whether He be risen or not, is very certainly as the angel said, not *here*." It is not until we are very nearly through the first volume that we come upon the idea from which the book gets its name. The host remarks, in the course of conversation, that he once began a book on the model of Plato's "Republic," and in reply to Lady Ambrose, explains what manner of book Plato's "Republic" is. "Suppose," exclaimed Leslie, "that we try this afternoon to construct a Utopia for ourselves. Let us embody our notions of life, as it ought to be, in a new 'Republic.'" The proposal finds favour with the party, and they address themselves to it. It is a pretty picture which the author draws of them on that pleasant lawn, as "every influence of the summer afternoon conspired to make all take kindly to the topic; the living airy whisper of the leaves overhead, the wandering scents of the flowers that the breeze just made perceptible, the musical splash of the fountain in its quiet restlessness, the luxury of the mossy turf as soft as sleep and rose leaves, and a far faint murmur of church bells that now and then invaded the ear, gently, like a vague appealing dream. Mr. Saunders, even, was caressed by his flattered sense into peacefulness, the high and dry light of the intellect ceased to scintillate in his eyes; the spirit of progress consented to take a temporary doze."

And there we leave them to discuss the high matter upon which they are engaged, merely adding by way of conclusion to our brief notice of this interesting book, that the author really seems to us to give his puppets fair play. His own views he carefully refrains from indicating. But the key-note of his work is struck in the lines from the Greek anthology which he has quoted on his title page:—

" Πάντα γίλωρ, καὶ πάντα κόνις, καὶ πάντα το μηδὲν
Πάντα γὰρ ἔξ ἀλόγων ἐστὶ τα γιγνομένα."

Winds of Doctrine: being an Examination of the Modern Theories of Automatism and Evolution. By CHARLES ELAM, M.D. London: Smith & Elder.

CHRISTIANITY, beyond question, is logically defensible, and, we may say, it is in possession. But if it is logically defensible, it is also logically assailable, and, in fact, for the last eighteen hundred years it has been assailed with every variety of argument which the wit of man could suggest. The latest and most fashionable weapon wielded against it is the doctrine of Evolution, and there, at last, it is confidently asserted, is the instrument which is fated to dispossess it, and to relegate it to the domain of extinct superstitions. And, undoubtedly, if the teaching of the Evolutionists as represented by Messrs. Huxley, Tyndal, and Spencer be true, Christianity must be false. The very foundation of Christianity is in the position that there is a God "igneus fons animarum," as Prudentius speaks, who created man and breathed into him a living soul. "Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem cæli et terræ," is the primary article of our creed. Overthrow that, and the whole edifice crumbles into dust. And the doctrines of the Evolutionists, if true, do most completely overthrow it, for, as Dr. Mivart has put it, with the strictest accuracy, those doctrines logically culminate in "three negations, viz., of God, the soul, and of virtue," it being an inevitable corollary from them that the idea of a personal Creator of the universe is irrational; while what has been considered as the soul, is shown to be merely the mechanical result of the interactions and affinities of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen; and virtue ceases to have any meaning, since every action of life being determined and limited absolutely by physical laws, can only be mechanical or automatic in its nature (Elam, p. 1). In these doctrines, however, we are called by persons whose eminent abilities are beyond question, to believe, under pain, as it were, of intellectual reprobation. Mr. Herbert Spencer tells us, more in sorrow than in anger, that those who do not accept them "have not kept pace with the recent advance in natural history or have lagged behind in science," while a learned German, Dr. Büchner, goes further, and brands the disbelievers in the new gospel of Materialism as "speculative idiots." (Elam, p. 25).

It certainly is worth while, therefore, to undertake the task to which Dr. Elam has set himself in the little book before us, and to examine the grounds upon which the teaching of the Evolutionists rests. Can it be proved to be so certainly true as to render it the duty of every candid mind to embrace it? Nay, can even a specious case be made out on behalf of it? or is it anything more than "a flimsy framework of hypothesis, constructed upon imaginary or irrelevant facts, with a complete departure from every canon of scientific investigation"? (Elam, p. 10.) This is the inquiry which Dr. Elam pursues throughout the 161 pages of his volume, in a temper of rigid fairness and dispassionate argument which we cannot too highly commend. He sets out with the position, which, however

questionable in itself, is, at all events, valuable evidence as to the spirit in which he writes, that "nothing can be more certain than that every man has a perfect right, moral and social, as well as legal, to express before a scientific assembly any opinion that he may hold in science or philosophy" (p. 10). And he protests that nothing can be more misplaced and illogical than the alarm which has been felt and expressed, in no measured terms, as to the consequence of the doctrine of the Evolutionists. It is quite right, he allows, that the consequences should be plainly stated, to show the importance of the issues involved, and so to serve as an incentive to inquiry and a preventive to feeble attempts at compromise. But it is not right, he urges, to import the consideration of the consequences into the discussion, when the question is, "Is the doctrine true or false?" (p. 11). And this is the sole point of Dr. Elam's inquiry. "Is the doctrine true? Not, who has said it, or what great authorities have upheld it, or under what overwhelming *prestige* it has been advanced, or what adventitious support it has received from personal or other sources. Nor, on the other hand," he continues, "is it the question, Is any other doctrine, theory, or tradition true or false? Every other question it is proposed to set aside for the time being, and to inquire solely, Is the doctrine of Evolution (of which human automatism is the logical outcome) true?" (p. 13.)

And first, Dr. Elam states the doctrine of evolution, and states it fairly enough, in the following propositions:—

1. "As to man's origin, it is now known that he is the last term in a long but uninterrupted series of developments, beginning with cosmic gas, and effected without the intervention of any but what are called secondary causes."

2. "As to his present relations to the universe of things, and his power over nature, he is an automaton, and nothing more than a part of that great series of causes and effects, which, in unbroken continuity composes that which is and has been and shall be, the sum of existence."

3. "To what goal the *race* is tending is not yet satisfactorily known, but individually the man resolves into carbonic acid, water, and ammonia, and has no more personal future existence than a consumed candle" (p. 26).

From the "cosmic gas," which presents itself to the eye of the Evolutionist's imagination as the earliest condition of our world—and in which it is to be inferred there existed but one form of matter, and probably only one form of force or motion (p. 26)—to man is a long journey, the most important point in which evidently is the appearance of Life; and upon that point in the Evolution theory we shall proceed to dwell briefly; it is the only point upon which we can touch in our present limits.

Organic life, then, according to Oken, is first recognized under the form of sea slime or mucus, or protoplasm (p. 26). The evangelists of the new gospel are not quite agreed "as to the mode in which this living mucus or protoplasm arises, but all are agreed that it is a product of inorganic

* Dr. Elam's references (which we need not here produce) fully bear out his statement of the Evolutionist doctrine.

matter and force, without any creative intervention" (Ibid.). Mr. Herbert Spencer, who is perhaps the most popular and the most authoritative of them, tells us "that organisms are 'highly differentiated portions' of the matter forming the earth's crust and its gaseous envelope; and that organization consists principally in the formation of an aggregate, by the continued incorporation of matter previously spread through a wider space; and also that this formation depends upon an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent homogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation" (p. 27).

This, then, we are told, is the origin of life in the sea slime, mucus, or protoplasm. "Then, by successive evolutions, we pass through amoeboids, worms, polyzoa, and ascidians, which last produced the two remaining stirpes of the vertebrata and the mollusca. Among the vertebrata are found sundry families of apes, from one of which, the catarrhini, man is directly and lineally descended" (p. 29).

"Such," Professor Huxley rapturously exclaims, "is Nature's great progression, from the formless to the formed, from the inorganic to the organic, from blind force to conscious intellect and will" (p. 30).

Now it cannot be denied that this statement has about it a definiteness and precision which is not without a certain attraction to the scientific mind; it is put forth with great gravity by writers of name as "certain truth," and is assumed as true in learned books, which indeed are based upon it. And yet, as Dr. Elam justly observes, "it is but a figment of the imagination": "a hypothesis in direct support of which not one single fact in the whole range of natural history or palæontology can be adduced." The proposition upon which the whole system of the Evolutionists rests, that living matter can be formed from not living matter by ordinary chemical affinities, has not a shred of evidence to support it, but is flatly opposed to the common experience of mankind. "Not only are we not able to produce living force, but we are unable to make a combination of non-living matter out of inorganic elements, resembling in any way matter that can or may live."

Of course this difficulty is felt by the Evolutionists. Dr. Elam quotes from Mr. Spencer the stereotyped answer. Mr. Spencer writes:—

"The chasm between the inorganic and the organic is being filled up. On the one hand, some four or five thousand compounds, once regarded as exclusively organic, have now been produced artificially from inorganic matter, and chemists do not doubt their ability so to produce the highest forms of organic matter.* On the other hand, the microscope has traced down organisms to simpler and simpler forms, until in the *Protogenes* of Professor Haeckel, there has been reached a type distinguishable from a fragment of albumen only by its finely granular character" (p. 51).

* Dr. Elam remarks in a note on this passage, "There are men who do not doubt their ability to square the circle, but this confidence in their own powers is not generally supposed to entitle them to the rank of great mathematicians."

Upon this Dr. Elam remarks, with just severity—

“It seems incredible that this should be intended for serious argument. Does not every candid observer know that this said chasm is not in any way being filled up; and that the chemist could quite as easily construct a full-grown ostrich as this despised bit of finely-granulated albumen? As for the four or five thousand compounds, as well might the goldsmith say that he did not doubt his ability to make gold out of a baser metal, because he had already moulded it and coloured it in four or five thousand different fashions. It is true that systematic writers on chemical science divide their subject into ‘organic’ and ‘inorganic,’ and also that, according to the individual views of the writer, many compound bodies are placed in one or other division interchangeably. It is further true that of late years many bodies once supposed to be exclusively of organic origin have been artificially formed. But it is not in any sense true that any substance even distantly resembling organisable matter has been formed. The line of demarcation is as wide as ever” (p. 51).

And here we must take our leave of Dr. Elam’s book. It would be interesting to follow him into his examination of Professor Huxley’s threefold unity, of the doctrines of Mr. Darwin, and of Professor Haeckel’s statement of the pedigree of man. But it is sufficient for our present purpose—referring those of our readers who are interested in these matters to the brilliant and scholarly pages before us—to confine ourselves to the objection that the very fundamental basis of the Evolutionist doctrine is as bare a hypothesis, as “mere a figment of the imagination,” as unsupported by experience, as destitute of verification, as the wildest of the theories of the philosophers of Lagado. When the Evolutionists succeed in making any—even the simplest—organism, out of inorganic matter, we will admit that their chemistry of life has some foundation beyond that of “deliberate and reiterated assertion.” Until then we must claim to be allowed, without any imputation of discourtesy, to rank it with the “project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, which were to be put into vials hermetically sealed, and let out to warm the air in raw, inclement summers.”

The Panegyrics of Father Segneri, S.J., Translated from the original Italian, with a Preface by the Rev. WILLIAM HUMPHREY, Priest of the same Society. London: R. Washbourne. 1877.

THE panegyrics contained in this volume are nearly all those which, after having been preached by F. Segneri in different parts of Italy, were first collected and published at Venice, in the year 1692. It is to be regretted that the translator has not added a preface telling something of the author’s life. For, though the name of F. Segneri is a familiar one, many do not know why he has claim to so much honour, and even a few brief notes on his power in his day, his sanctity and his zeal, would have added still more weight to his words.

Paolo Segneri was born in 1624, and after his entrance into the Society of Jesus it soon became apparent that preaching would be the chief labour

of his life. He went about Italy from town to town, always travelling on foot, dressed in a worn old cassock, with a crucifix on his breast; most preachers at the time affected a style of ornate eloquence, but he thought not of rhetorical display, but of the good of his hearers. It is true that his deep study of the classics sometimes coloured his imagery, but his words were simple and earnest. He spoke not for the ears, but for the soul; hence the life and value which these discourses possess in our day, as in his. There is in them a wonderful power of unveiling for our admiration the character or life of the saints, by a broad, full view, which allows the mind to grasp easily their chief points of excellence and of glory. Very seldom is there a word that tells us of the two hundred years between us and their first utterance; but where a suggestion of the imperfect profane science of the time occurs, its quaintness only serves to remind us that, while the world throws down its old beliefs that it may build up new knowledge on the ruins, the Church with a life, that scarcely seems to pass, because it is not to end, holds now the same treasures of divine science which it held two centuries ago, and will hold for uncounted centuries to come. The panegyric of the Immaculate Conception preached more than a hundred and fifty (or nearer two hundred) years before the definition as an article of faith, is an example of this unchangeableness, and at the same time a refutation of the error of those who will have it that councils and Papal definitions give us new truths, and who with careless inaccuracy refuse to distinguish between imposing a new belief and declaring that an old one is one of the certainties of faith.

It is said that since Savonarola no man ever laid such strong hold upon the popular mind in Italy as F. Segneri; but Segneri possessed as much prudence as eloquence. We may well believe that his influence was due, not so much to his natural talents as to the unction which springs from hidden sanctity. His biographers record that when he entered the Jesuit novitiate at the early age of fourteen he brought with him, unstained, his baptismal innocence, and that as years went by those who lived with him were reminded of St. Aloysius, by his union of rigorous penance with perfect holiness of life. Worn out by his apostolic labours in many a town and village scattered over the land, he died at the age of seventy, in the year 1694, leaving behind him a widespread fame, and many religious books to perpetuate his work. One of these was the "*Panegirici Sacri*" published two years before his death. We can give the book no better praise than to say that the sermons are all, and more than all, we should expect from such a man. The translation is excellent, the English being accurate with scarcely any exception, the style easy and modern without losing the tone of the original. We may point out one slight mistake which we have noticed. On page 121, "*Andrea, che fu il Decano,*" &c., is translated "Andrew, who became the chief of the Apostolic college." *Decano* is like the French word *doyen*, and merely means that Andrew was the eldest in point of calling. But we must repeat, the translation is worthy of the work, and the discourses themselves are masterpieces, models of panegyrics.

The Life of Our Lord commemorated in the Mass, a Method of Assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. By EDWARD G. BAGSHAW, Bishop of Nottingham; Second Edition. Nottingham, and London: R. Wasthorne.

THERE is an admirable passage in one of F. Newman's works, where allusion is made to the diversity of the forms of prayer which the faithful use while they join in heart with the celebrant of the one Sacrifice. This freedom of the mind is a distinctive mark of the worship of the Church. It is the natural outgrowth of her spirit of liberty, and yet of perfect unity. "Each in his place, with his own heart, with his own wants, with his own thoughts, with his own intention, with his own prayers, separate, but concordant, watching what is going on, watching its progress, uniting in its consummation;—not painfully and hopelessly following a hard form of prayer from beginning to end, but like a concert of musical instruments, each different, but concurring in a sweet harmony, we take our part with God's priest, supporting him, yet guided by him." Out of the diversity of devotion, or the various inclinations of the same individuals at different times, arises the need of many methods of prayer at Mass; and to satisfy this want books are constantly appearing, and in most cases are very welcome. The Right Rev. Dr. Bagshaw's publication (which we are glad to see in its second edition) is especially to be commended. It contains but a few pages, yet these must be the fruit of much study and careful thought. The method is not a course of prayers, but rather a course of suggestions for meditation, texts of Scripture being chosen to correspond with each part of the Mass. They are very happily selected to accompany the various actions and prayers, and the mind is carried by a continuous train of thought through the coming of the Redeemer, His teaching and Passion, and the many words and promises relating to the Blessed Sacrament, as well as its institution; so that those who use this method carry out in the most literal sense the words which are placed as a fitting motto on the title page, "Do this for a commemoration of Me."

Why are We Roman Catholics? Because We are Reasonable Men. By HERMANN JOSEPH GRAF FUGGER GLÖTT, Priest of the Society of Jesus. From the German. London: Burns & Oates. 1876.

FATHER FUGGER has, we believe, the honour of being the one Jesuit whom Prince Bismarck could not expel from Germany. As a descendant of a mediatised princely family, he claimed exemption from the law of expulsion, and, notwithstanding pressure from Berlin, the Bavarian Senate conceded his claim. His pamphlet which now lies before us is well known in Germany, and we are glad to see it in its English dress. It is a brief popular treatise on the logical grounds of the Catholic faith. To a certain extent, it may be said to be controversial, but it is a

sign of the times that it does not deal with Catholicity as against Protestantism, but looks rather to the infidel position, and argues from first principles. A few years ago the writer of a controversial pamphlet would have probably omitted at least one-half of Father Fugger's chapters, and taken for granted the existence of God and of the soul and the divinity of Jesus Christ. Nowadays all this is changed, and often, even when we have to deal with a Protestant, we find that we must encounter what we may call implicit scepticism. Outside the Church, the victims of doubt were perhaps never more numerous than they are at present. They ask not—Why am I to be a Protestant or a Catholic? This is no longer the question; but why am I to hold any belief at all? What is there that is reasonable in faith? Where is the evidence that is to tell me whom, why, and what to believe?

It is for these that Father Fugger's little book is written. It is wonderfully concise, perhaps a little too concise in some respects, but really it deals with questions that are usually answered in lengthy treatises, and, if we understand its object aright, it is meant to give to thinking men an outline of the proof of its thesis which they can readily develop themselves, rather than to any extent to develop it for them. And its brevity has certain marked advantages. It is easy to follow the line of the argument, the attention is neither wearied nor distracted, the diction is forcible, at times almost epigrammatic. And it will perhaps attract the attention and carry conviction to the minds of some who would not have the patience to peruse in the first instance a more elaborate treatise.

"With regard to the matter," says Father Fugger in his introduction, "the title I think expresses it clearly enough. This is not a polemical treatise meant to entangle the opponents of Catholicity in their own contradictions, nor is it an apology in the proper sense of the word, intended to bring in Catholicity triumphantly clear on all sides; its object is rather to lay bare quite simply, and as far as possible with mathematical coldness and brevity, those pillars upon which the edifice of the Catholic faith rests" (p. 2).

We have already said that F. Fugger's argument is condensed into a very small space, wide as is the scope of his pamphlet, it does not consist of more than ninety pages. We cannot, therefore, attempt to give an abstract of it. We shall merely give a few extracts, and note some points that have particularly struck us in reading it. At the outset, he denounces the widely-spread error that we only know the visible and the sensible, that all else has nothing to do with reason, but belongs to the realm of imagination and faith. "The limit of sensible experiences is also the limit of thought," says Karl Vogt. "Nothing is truly real," adds Feuerbach, "but the objects of the senses, or the sensible." F. Fugger replies by exposing the double error that we know only the visible, and that faith has nothing to do with reason. We can prove the fact of revelation. There is more than one line of proof, he gives us that which appears to him to be most striking. Faith is either reasonable or unreasonable, and if it is reasonable the grounds on which it rests must be capable of demonstration.

"It might here be objected," says F. Fugger, "that this is not the Catholic view of the question, for a Catholic is bound to believe without seeing. In order to show that my train of argument is truly Catholic, I will cite a few of the utterances of some of the most distinguished teachers of the Church, and finally of the authoritative Church herself. S. Augustine says: 'By reason of that which thou seest, thou believest that which thou seest not.' S. Thomas Aquinas expresses the same thought still more clearly. He says 'he would not believe if he did not see that he was bound to believe.' For this reason, Pius IX. says in the Encyclical of December 12, 1855: "The exercise of the reason precedes faith." Innocent XI., however, is the most explicit, for he condemned as erroneous the proposition, 'An act of faith is consistent with there being only probable reasons for thinking that God has revealed the truth in question.' It is then, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, inconsistent for any Catholic—let us mark the word—to accept or believe a truth as revelation until he has a real certainty that God has revealed it" (p. 8).

Of course this last statement must be read in the light of the whole treatise. F. Fugger discusses the nature of this certainty, previously going into the question of certainty in general.

"And now," he continues (p. 11), "to return to our subject, we must say the certainty which a Catholic *must* have that the truth which he is to believe is revealed, must be founded on some conclusive reason. There may be difficulties on the other side to overcome, so that doubt would not be impossible; but the reason, or reasons upon which he decides upon accepting the revelation, must be of such a nature that on calm consideration he sees them to be obligatory. After these elucidations we can now proceed to unfold that train of reasoning which, as it appears to us, ought to lead every thoughtful mind to the conviction that the Catholic faith actually has been revealed by God. If we wish to put before ourselves a brief sketch of the path which we are about to travel, it may be presented in this form:—

"Reason requires that we should maintain,

"1. The spiritual nature of the human soul.

"2. The existence of a personal God.

"3. The historical fact of the Incarnation of this God in the person of Christ.

"4. The Divine mission and guidance of the apostolical teaching-body in the Roman Catholic Church.

"These proved, it is reasonable to yield unconditional faith to this divinely commissioned and divinely protected teaching body, in all questions that belong to it; or it is reasonable to believe and to live as a Catholic" (pp. 11, 12).

In chapters iii. to vi. the two first of these four points are developed. The argument in chapter vi. against objections drawn from the existence of moral and physical evil is, we believe, sound, but perhaps too briefly expressed. This, however, is the only point on which F. Fugger's brevity has involved him in any danger of obscurity, and his style throughout is remarkably clear, even when dealing with difficult subjects, and we heartily wish that in this matter Germans in general would only take example from this Bavarian Jesuit. The seventh chapter (pp. 49—66) develops the third point. The argument, of course, turns mainly upon the historical fact of the Resurrection. It would be difficult to set forth more lucidly and

more briefly the proofs of the divinity of our Lord. F. Fugger examines successively the authority of the Gospel narrative and the testimony of tradition, and examines the "myth" theory of Strauss, and the attempt to explain the success of Christianity as the mere natural effect of its high morality. Subsidiary to this is a short examination of the question of miracles (pp. 54—57). On the subject of the connection between the sanctions of the Christian code of morals and the belief in the Resurrection, Strauss is quoted very effectively.

"If," says F. Fugger, "the claims of the most perfect scheme of morality are not supported by an unshakeable conviction of its obligation and of a future life, they will not receive a moment's consideration from the majority of mankind, still less will they influence their minds during nineteen centuries. S. Paul seems to say as much:—'If Christ had not risen, then are we of all men the most miserable.' Strauss shared the same opinion to some extent. He observes, 'It may be humiliating to human pride, but it is quite true: Jesus might have taught all that was true and good, He might have given an imperfect view confined to what was difficult, which commonly makes a deeper impression on the crowd; all His teachings would have been scattered like loose leaves to the wind, if these leaves had not been united and held together, as by a strong bond, by the superstitious belief in His Resurrection.' Hence it was not the morality which supported the belief, but the belief which supported the morality" (pp. 53, 54). There is a telling reference to the history of Protestantism at p. 58. Speaking of the Gospels, F. Fugger remarks:—

"We are far from granting that the belief in Christ rests upon these documents. . . . No doubt the documents have contributed in some degree to the maintenance of that faith; but that books, apart from the living Church, are incapable of producing such a result, Protestantism during three hundred years has abundantly proved."

The eighth chapter deals with the fourth and concluding portion of the argument. Here we find the Protestant position and that of the "Old Catholics" incidentally discussed. Of the Protestant theory that the Holy Ghost guides any man who chooses to open the Scriptures and construct a creed from them, F. Fugger says:—"In this system it is quite possible that the Pope, or the bishops, or the priests may preach to men what is false; but God will work in the minds of men, even of infidels who desire to be instructed, so that they shall accept only what is true; the untrue they shall not hear, or misunderstand it so far as to change it into truth, &c. It will be admitted that this miracle is much more unintelligible, much more comprehensive, and much more difficult to prove than the miracle involved in Papal Infallibility" (p. 71). The historical proof of the authority of the Catholic Church is well drawn out in the concluding pages, and there are some very apposite remarks on the Vatican Council and the dogma of Papal infallibility. "If we could suppose that the council had erred," says our author, "then, following up our reasonings, the only course left to us would be the entire renunciation of Christianity. Certainly no sensible Christian could join the so-called Old Catholic movement."

We have said enough to show that the book is a remarkable one. We believe that there is much in its form and spirit which will especially commend it to the English mind, and we are glad to hear that it is already obtaining a wide circle of readers.

An English Carmelite. The Life of Catherine Burton, Mother Mary Xaveria of the Angels, of the English Teresian Convent at Antwerp. Collected from her own writings and other sources by Father THOMAS HUNTER, of the Society of Jesus. Burns & Oates. 1876.

THIS eighteenth volume of the "Quarterly Series" of admirable books under the editorship of F. Coleridge is undoubtedly one of the most charming of the whole course. Catherine Burton was a nun of the convent of English Teresians, whose prioress had been trained by the famous Anne of S. Bartholomew, almost as celebrated a Carmelite as the better-known Anne of Jesus, renowned in the first settlement of the Carmelites in France under the conduct of "Mademoiselle" Acarie. From France Mother Anne of Jesus and several of her companions went to Flanders, to found Carmelite houses; and the community in which Miss Burton and many other English ladies had found a home left Antwerp in 1794, and settled at Lanherne, in Cornwall. F. Thomas Hunter, who entered the Society of Jesus in 1684, wrote the present life for the use of the nuns. Miss Burton was born near Bury St. Edmunds in Suffolk in 1668, but of a Yorkshire family. Her father had intended entering the Jesuits' Society as a lay brother after his wife's death, but just as he was about to begin his noviciate he died, leaving an example of true and unaffected devotedness to his large family of ten children. So at least, says F. Hunter, or whoever "collected" the first chapter, but Miss Burton herself in her autobiography gives the number of her family as eight. Her own account of her early years and childish mortifications is very beautifully and simply told, as well as the singular affection with which she was gifted to S. Teresa and S. Francis Xavier, whom she called "her dear Xaverius." Like most persons who were hereafter to attain great holiness, she was afflicted with much sickness of a strange kind, and, as the healing art at that time was of a most barbarous description, Miss Burton suffered tortures from the doctors who were called in to relieve her. She had to endure "bitter potions, sweats, vomits, bleeding, and Spanish flies," all of which were submitted to "for the love of God," though they did her no good, and she was at last cured after following the devotions called the "Ten Fridays of S. Francis Xavier." The manifest care of this saint over his devoted and affectionate child is one of the most beautiful points of this exquisite life; and Miss Burton had recourse to him on every occasion with the simplest faith that her pleading would be heard. The Carmelite fare was her great difficulty on arriving in Flanders, for she had so peculiar a loathing for eggs that she had not

eaten one for seven years. The prioress bade her ask S. Francis to help her out of this difficulty, and she soon began to eat eggs and all the other fare heartily, without the slightest inconvenience. In fact, she says herself, "I thought all that came to the refectory savoured to me like the manna that fell from Heaven." From her profession in 1695 to her death in 1714, Miss Burton, as Sister Mary Xaveria, gave an example to all the nuns, young and old, who had any intercourse with her. She was very early elected prioress, when her wise and admirable rule was long remembered. In the midst of the severest trials of the soul, and bodily sickness, her straightforward, cheerful simplicity of life and conduct were always the same, and must have given her nuns and novices a clear and living insight into the principles of the spiritual life. Mary Xaveria's last illness was so terrible that it almost seems impossible for anyone human to have sustained such sufferings and such remedies in the way she did. She died on the last day of the "Ten Fridays" in what is called the "Great Novena" of S. Francis Xavier, and at exactly the same age (forty-six) as the Apostle of the Indies. Throughout her life and at death, therefore, the admirable mutual chain of devotion and protection between the saint and his affectionate child remained unbroken. *

We cannot conclude this slight notice of a biography which we hope has made its way into many other besides Catholic houses, without again recording our thanks to the discerning Editor of this series of solid Catholic works. There is no doubt that its issue has led many to read who scarcely ever read before, and that, having opened their minds to the pleasures as well as uses of literature, these books are laying the foundation among us of a genuine taste for useful reading; and that, moreover, such biographies as these will do more to spread the knowledge of our faith, and a right understanding of practical Catholic life, than any amount of controversy could ever achieve among those outside the Church.

La Divinité de l'Eglise manifestée par Sa Charité; ou, Tableau Universel de la Charité Catholique. Par le Cardinal G. BALUFFI, Archevêque—Evêque d'Imola. Traduit de la Italien par M. Abbé V. POSTEL. Paris: C. Dillet.

IT is a pleasure to us to notice this book, which appeared nearly twenty years ago, and which has not attracted the attention it deserves. It is an attempt to make known through the *lingua Franca* of Europe one of those works—of which there are so many—highly prized and esteemed by Catholic Italy, but hardly heard of elsewhere. The book, however, is not a mere version from the Italian. It is enriched with a number of notes—of unequal merit indeed, but always interesting—by the translator, the Abbé Postel, and is introduced by an eloquent letter to him from the Bishop of Orleans. The author's argument may be said to be given in certain words of our Blessed Lord. "Ipsa opera quæ ego facio testi-

moniam perhibent de me, quia Pater misit me." (Evan. secun. Joan., c. v.) The appeal which Jesus Christ here makes in support of His mission, the author makes in support of the mission of the Catholic Church. "She undoubtedly possesses" he observes, "abundant evidence in prophecy, in miracles, in the constancy of her martyrs, in her wonderful extension throughout the world; and these notes, which mark her off from all other Christian communions, irrefragably show her to be the one spouse of Jesus Christ. But her charity, on the other hand, is enough by itself to establish that truth; and in the multitude of the benefits which she has diffused and ever diffuses among men, we find the sure indication that he who separates from her, not only quits the one ark of salvation, but cuts himself off from the only source of happiness open in this world to the human race" (Preface de l'Auteur). Such is the thesis which the author has developed in this general sketch of Catholic charity. In chapter after chapter he shows how the Church has done the works that none other has done; how she has laboured to eradicate cruelty in the laws and manners of peoples; how she has restored society, abolished slavery, fettered tyranny, laboured with a zeal, the sources of which neither persecution nor indifference could dry up, in works of spiritual and corporal mercy; nay, how even Jews and heretics, in stern and hard times, have been sheltered under the wing of her pity, and she has ever stood out before the world as "a never-failing fount of humanity, equity, forbearance, and compassion." Perhaps one of the most telling chapters is that in which the results of Christian charity and un-Christian philanthropy are contrasted (chap. xxv.). But our space is too limited to admit of our quoting from it. We can only refer our readers to its pages.

In conclusion we must observe that the general excellence of the book is somewhat marred by curious misapprehensions here and there of things English. Thus, for example, the author tells us, gravely, "Il n'y a pas long-temps que dans les Îles-Britanniques on pouvait vendre les femmes au marché; . . . maintenant la chose est défendue."* And the translator is very hard upon us. He seldom misses an opportunity of adding a note to express his dislike of us, and it must be admitted that the opportunities are somewhat tempting. Thus a reference in the text to the hideous tyranny practised so long in Ireland under the penal laws, supplies him with a peg upon which he hangs the following remarks: "Ah! comment l'Angleterre ose-t-elle reprocher au gouvernement napolitain de rares mesures de rigueur contre l'île de Sicile? Comment ose-t-elle, sans avoir le rongeur au front, prononcer à la face de l'Europe le nom tout seul de la liberté! Peuple de marchands, que Jesus eut chassés du Temple, et que n'y peuvent entrer assez pour comprendre le premier mot de 'Evangile!'"†

* Vol. i. p. 298.

† Vol. ii. p. 162.

The Social Methods of Roman Catholicism in England. By M. C. BISHOP.
"Contemporary Review," March, 1877.

AMONG the many "questions of the day," as the phrase is, the question of the dangerous classes is, perhaps, the one which politicians and sociologists most shrink from facing; and yet, as an eminent French publicist* has recently remarked, it is a question upon which the life of modern nations depends; for, as he justly observes, "Le pauperisme, c'est la misère montée à la situation d'un des pouvoirs de l'Etat, et menaçante la société d'une terrible inondation."

Mrs. Bishop's object in the most interesting paper which she has contributed to the March number of the "Contemporary Review" is to show how in our large towns this question is solved by Catholic methods. "By every political and social law," she truly says, "the million despairing victims of English misrule in Ireland" who have been transplanted to our own great centres of labour, and "have settled wherever the roughest and worst-paid work has to be done, ought to be the least manageable and most explosive of the dangerous classes." And "that the Irish do not figure yet more largely than they do in the criminal statistics of our great cities,—that this alien million is not an advanced cancer in the English body politic, is due," she shows, "not to policemen, but to priests; not to 'necessary progress,' but to the agents of Catholic charity."

For the proof and illustration of her argument Mrs. Bishop has gone to the East London missions. We wish our space allowed us to quote from the touching descriptions and weighty reflections of which her paper is full. But we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the article itself, and with an expression of our hope that it is but the pledge and earnest of a volume upon the vitally important subject which it so ably discusses.

A Sermon preached at S. Beuno's College, July 30, 1876, on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of the Lord Bishop of Shrewsbury. By JOHN MORRIS, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Published at his Lordship's request, with the Address then presented. London: Burns & Oates. 1876.

IT was an oversight that left this beautiful sermon unnoticed in our last issue. But it will still be welcome for its intrinsic value, although the joyous anniversary that occasioned it has become dim in the distance of a past year. As might be expected, the grand college, so well known, yet so little seen in its seclusion among the Welsh hills, was enthusiastic in celebrating the Silver Jubilee of the Bishop, who has imposed ordaining hands on two hundred and nineteen members of the community, and has endeared himself to it by "unvarying kindness, courtesy, and support." The sermon is very suitable to the event that occasioned it. It is not a

* M. Alphonse Karr, in "Figaro."

theological study, but professedly sympathetic words, which, when uttered *inter domesticos parietes*, with all the aid of local colouring and warmth of atmosphere created by the occasion, must have been very telling, and has still an effective grace in the less congenial form of the printed page. We have the thoughts which the presence of a Bishop among his flock never fails to awaken, and the far-reaching results of his functions and duties, pictured in words more beautiful than we have hitherto seen. We give an extract describing the grace of a Bishop's blessing: our readers will say that it is the poetry of preaching:—

"It seems but a simple thing to remember how gladly we kneel for a Bishop's blessing. But yet it is no light privilege, for the blessing of a Bishop is the blessing of the God he represents. A blessing given by a priest is something sacred and unearthly, consecrating in some sort and dedicating to God that upon which it falls. Even the simplest exercise of the priestly power of blessing, perhaps the only act that a newly-ordained priest can perform without the need of any permission, is yet one that the Church ranks among the Sacramentals, and holy water becomes the means of increasing sanctifying grace. The blessing of the priest at the end of mass reminds us of our Lord lifting up His hands and blessing His Apostles before He left them. The priest's blessing brings peace and sanctification, yet the priestly power of benediction comes forth from the power of the Bishop as a stream flows from its fountain. In the Bishop it resides in a plenitude that is surpassed upon earth only by the still completer fullness of the Apostolic blessing. Whenever we meet our Bishop, we throng about him and kneel till he has blessed us, and in the church, as he passes to and fro, he scatters his benediction around him, or still more solemnly chants it from the altar. Our hearts are soothed and strengthened we scarcely know how; but we should be mindful that we depart with the hallowing influences upon us of a benediction that specially dedicates all upon which it falls to the sacred service of God" (p. 7).

A Course of Lectures on the Identity of the British, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Catholic Church, in reply to the Bishop of Manchester. By Rev. F. BILSBORROW, of Newsham. Preston: no date.

AMONG the minor works we have received for notice we find this little course of lectures, in which a very important question is very ably discussed. Ostensibly they are a reply to some statements made by Dr. Fraser, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester, in a sermon in which he alleged that the Established Church was the Church of the "earliest Christian inhabitants of Britain." Joining issue with him on this point, F. Bilsborrow develops in his five lectures the historical argument for Catholicity in England. The lectures are popular in style without being in any sense of the word superficial, and they show wide reading, and give evidence of much careful collection and comparison of facts bearing upon the history of the Church in England. We are sorry that they are not better printed. Apparently they are bodily reprints from the columns of a newspaper. They certainly deserve to appear in a more attractive form.

Union with Our Lord Jesus Christ in His principal Mysteries. For All Seasons of the Year. By the Rev. F. JOHN BAPTIST SAINT JURE, of the Society of Jesus. Translation revised by a Father of the same Society. Third Edition. New York: H. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1876.

A THIRD edition, clear printing and strong binding, an attractive title, the name of an author "renowned for his learning and holiness of life," and the *imprimatur* of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York, are the excellent credentials with which this work comes into our hands. It recommends itself, and will be found, if carefully studied, bearing out to the last page fulfilment of the promise given in its title. It is a persuasive teacher of an important, we may say *the* important, aim of Christian life,—knowledge of the mysteries of Our Lord's life, and, through that knowledge, union with Him. The writer was a man of one idea, but it is a very comprehensive one, all sufficient, and fruitful, as S. Paul judged it to be (1 Cor. ii. 2). It was the inspiration of this work as of all he wrote, as may be judged from the names given in the preface:—"The knowledge and love of Our Lord Jesus Christ," "The Book of the Elect; or, Jesus Crucified," "The Master; or, Jesus Teaching Men." Men of one idea are not usually shallow writers, whatever defects they may have; and, we were prepared to find in this book writing well thought out and exhaustive; that we have found, and more, the charm of intense piety pervading it. The translator truly says, the work "is peculiar in its character. . . suggestive of matter for reflection and meditation rather than one intended for mere spiritual reading." We feel the same difficulty in describing it exactly, and cannot describe it in a phrase. It is not a book of spiritual reading—although valuable for that purpose—for it demands closer and more laborious attention than is usually implied by spiritual reading. Thus, Holy Communion is recommended (p. 35) as a preparation for each *Exercise*: what an exercise is, we shall mention hereafter. Nor is it, although suggestive of matter for reflection and meditation, a collection of meditations ordinarily so-called. We shall, perhaps, give the best idea of the work by a slender outline.

The Mysteries of the Incarnate Life are distributed through the ecclesiastical seasons. Advent is occupied with the Incarnation. The Nativity, the Circumcision, the Adoration of the Magi, the Flight into Egypt, and the Hidden Life, are embraced within Christmas and Lent. The study of the Passion and Death of Our Lord is assigned to Lent. From Easter to Corpus Christi, Our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, are chosen for meditation. And the last season, from the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament to Advent, has for its subject the Holy Eucharist considered as a Sacrament and a Sacrifice. Leaving out subordinate matters, such as the suggestive counsels and special directions that fall under particular headings, we find that the Practice or Exercise for each season of the year has six divisions:—the *subject-matter* or mystery proposed for consideration and practice; the *affections* and *interior*

acts, in which the soul must keep itself, as it were, buried during the season of the mystery; *the virtues* most prominent in the mystery, and which are to be daily produced by faithful imitation; *meditations* and *readings* on the mysteries (which are not, however, given at length in the translation, but merely suggested); and *ejaculatory verses*, which will keep the mystery fresh in the recollection, and the soul, through habitual recollection of the mystery, in union with Our Lord.

Our readers may judge how elaborately the author has constructed his work. Evidently he thought no pains superfluous that would enable him to carry out perfectly the conception he had formed, and to give his readers a help worthy of the object he proposes to them. The book must be used in a like spirit. It will not profit much to turn over lightly a page here and there; it exacts careful reading,—in a word, study. If used, as the author directs, it will certainly help devout souls to attain, in no slight degree, the great grace promised in its title,—“Union with Our Lord Jesus Christ.”

St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland. Who he was—Where he came from—What he taught. An Answer to certain Protestant Clergymen. By a Layman. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, 50, Upper Sackville-street.

THE only reason there can have been for making this pamphlet “An Answer to certain Protestant Clergymen” is, that the author wanted a plea for publishing a contribution to an interesting chapter of Church history. The gentlemen to whom the answer has been vouchsafed are too insignificant to deserve consideration—at least, the serious consideration they have received. We are reminded of the destruction among the sea-gulls, by the shells of the eighty-ton gun in its trial at Shoeburyness. The pamphlet is written with ability enough to excuse all excuses for its publication. However, the author has used the publication of two efforts to prove S. Patrick a disciple of Luther, as pegs on which to hang dissertations that could well stand alone; and no doubt the writers honoured by his notice of their eccentricities will feel flattered, although on his title-page he applies to them a quotation from Sydney Smith,—“Gentlemen, we respect you very sincerely, but are astonished at your existence.” Perhaps he knows them better than we do, and has some untold reasons for his “respect”; but certainly it is not the intelligence that could conceive, or the common sense that could publish, and suppose that any one would read and esteem as arguments the puerilities that assert the Protestantism of Ireland’s Apostle. The line of argument adopted by one of the writers refuted in the pamphlet is very curious. In order to prove “what doctrines and practices S. Patrick taught,” he resolves “to quote only from the earliest authentic and admitted writings to the Saint himself.” Wise resolution! The negative line of argument is an admirable one for attributing to the Saint a system, which advances to perfection by negations. The idea is capable of great development and ap-

plication. For instance, applied not to S. Patrick, but to S. Bartholomew, or other of the early saints who have left no writings, it would very conclusively prove him not to have believed a single article of the creed. Indeed, there are few saints to whom such an arbitrarily-chosen test would be more unfairly applied than to S. Patrick. He was not a writer of books. He engraved his teaching on the life of a nation, and it may still be read as on the page of an open book. The "Canons" bearing his name are few, and on matters of discipline. His Hymn or "Lorica" is a prayer of supplication. The "Letter to Coroticus" was an expostulation addressed to a piratical chieftain, in which dogmatic teaching would be sought as fittingly as in S. Paul's Epistle to Philemon. And the character of the Saint's most important writing, the "Confession," may be judged from a well-chosen extract given in the pamphlet. "I have now," writes S. Patrick, "simply informed my brethren and fellow servants who have believed me *why* I have preached and *preach* still to strengthen and confirm your faith." However, scanty as are the writings left to the Church by the Apostle of Ireland, there are a few passages to be found that would not quite harmonize with the preaching usually heard in the conventicles of disestablished Protestantism. Not to speak at length of the evidence afforded of the invocation of saints, the necessity of Holy Orders, and the authority of inspired books rejected from the Protestant canon, we give one passage from the "canons," which the upholders of the Saint's Protestantism might commend to the attention of their colleagues at the Synod now sitting in Dublin. It will infallibly settle all the controversies engaging the attention of that vigorous assembly. The following, Usher's translation, will hardly be questioned, although his innocent explanation may fare less happily:—"Whenever any cause that is very difficult, and unknown unto all the judges of the Scottish nation, shall arise, it is rightly to be referred to the See of the Archbishop of the Irish (that is, of Patrick), and to the examination of the prelate thereof. But if there, by him and his wise men, a cause of this nature cannot easily be made up, we have decreed it shall be sent to the See Apostolic, that is to say, to the chair of the Apostle Peter, which hath the authority of the city of Rome."

The author of "S. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, &c.," taking a broader view of the subject than was possible within the lines laid down by the writers whom he condescends to extinguish, has given us, in an ably-written epitome, the doctrines and practices of the Early Irish Church, and, therefore, of its Apostle. He shows "by the testimony of all the ancient writers of his Life that S. Patrick came from Rome to Ireland; and from his 'Confession,' and from the writings of his disciples, that he taught Catholic doctrine in its fulness . . . that the teaching in the ancient schools was strictly Catholic; that Ireland in these first bright ages was intimately united with the universal Church; and that if she did err" (in reference to the celebration of Easter) "it was only in a matter of discipline; that when she clearly recognized her error—when Rome spoke—she conformed to the usages of Christendom . . . In truth, there never existed such a prodigy as a Protestant S. Patrick" (p. 59).

The pamphlet contains a large amount of information, and is suggestive

of the abundant sources of knowledge on the history of the Early Irish Church, that are being daily opened. Each chapter—there are five—is followed by notes of great utility to readers who are not well acquainted with the names and writings referred to in the work; and therefore it will be especially valuable, as a handy-book of reference, to many who are not at home in the learned works of later Irish antiquaries, or perchance are scared from the study of an interesting period in the history of a devoted Church by the unfamiliar aspect of the names of writers, places, and manuscripts that appear at every step.

Scheme for Providing Pensions for Catholic Schoolmasters. Dedicated to His Lordship the Bishop of Southwark. By W. J. C. 1877.

OWING to the recent changes in national education and the necessity of vigorous action, our schools and teachers are now being regulated more and more by system. A want which still remains in this system would be well filled, if the scheme now before us could be adopted and found practicable in working. It would improve the position of schoolmasters in the best and most telling manner, and thus would doubtless increase their number, efficiency, and earnestness. For this reason these few leaves are worthy of examination. The writer points out how the servants of the Government work willingly for less pay than other men, because they are sure of a pension in the last years of their life. Now it is only reasonable to suppose that many able youths would devote themselves to teaching in our schools, if they were certain that after being employed for their best years they would be provided for should they live past the age of work. The problem, How could this be done? seems difficult; but a solution, plausible and satisfactory at least on paper, is suggested by J. W. C. The teacher would be required to give to the fund $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of his salary, an equal sum being given by the Poor School Committee. The expense would not be so great as it appears at first sight; for the author contends that the money prizes now given could be dispensed with in order to provide the greater advantage of future pensions, and that each prize of five pounds would be equal to more than the yearly percentage required for two teachers. J. W. C.'s figures are worth the attention of the Poor School Committee, as they are clearly set forth, and his whole plan founded on the pension systems of the Railway Clearing House and the London and South-Western Railway Company, which have given very satisfactory results. If some scheme for the purpose could be adopted, we do not hesitate to say that a great step would be taken towards strengthening the basis of Catholic education in this country, by holding out a tangible inducement to efficient men to give the work of their lives to its service.

The Papal Conclaves, as They Were and as They Are. By T. ADOLPHUS TROLLOPE. London: Chapman & Hall. 1876.

MR. TROLLOPE, doubtless, had some end in view when he made up his mind to write this book, but it is very difficult, and perhaps very useless, to conjecture what that end might be. The spirit of mockery is not a good spirit, for there are some matters which even men given to profaneness leave alone for some reason or other, matters which are intrinsically so grave that mere common sense restrains men from meddling with them, at least, in wantonness and levity.

Mr. Trollope, however, thinks he has a reason for doing that which he has done.

"It is the purpose of this volume, then," he says (p. 4), "to give such a general account of the working of the system, by which for more than fifteen centuries the Popes have been chosen, as may be, it is hoped, made interesting to the general reader, as distinguished from the special student. To the latter the present writer makes no pretence of offering anything that he does not already well know."

On this latter point, we think Mr. Trollope has not been quite just to himself, for we hope to show that the "special student" will derive knowledge from his labours that is not at present in his possession, though the general reader may be very familiar with it. Our learned, but modest author, considers the Church to have been an unformed mass when she came forth out of the hands of our Lord, as geologists are pleased to describe the earth. Accordingly he speaks of the hierarchy as being in its beginnings rude and unshaped. "There are organisms," he says (p. 5), "the most natural and most to be expected development of which is one in contradiction to the organic principles they profess. And it may probably be considered that the greatest social organism which the world has ever seen, the Catholic Church, may be one of these."

Upon this hypothesis, assumed without proof, without even the pretence of a proof, the author gives a title to book i. of his volume in the following terms: "Hierarchy in state of Fluidity."

According to Mr. Trollope, our Lord left the government of his Church to the chances of men's passions, interests, and prejudices, to be moulded into form by foreign and even hostile influences.

The title of book ii. is "Noble Boys at Play," and yet the reader is expected to read this tract as serious history.

Mr. Trollope, perhaps, did not mean to write seriously, and being ill-disposed to treat sacred things with the reverence due to them, and which men, who have nothing better to guide them than their common sense, observe, has undertaken to make a mockery and a jest of the most solemn assembly gathered together for the doing of a deed the gravity and importance of which no language can adequately express.

He has picked up the idle stories and the careless jests which men too often are not ashamed nor afraid to indulge in, when their interests or

desires have not been satisfied. He admits that Gregorio Leti is not to be trusted, and yet he walks in his ways, and perpetuates his work.

The writer of this book is not a Catholic, that is plain, but what he believes is more than we can tell, yet he undertakes to tell his readers all that passes within the Church, to which he is a stranger, and pretends to a knowledge of the thoughts and intentions of Catholics, even of Cardinals and Popes. But, then, he believes these latter to be men of very indifferent repute; "in fact," he says, in a note (p. 120), "but few papal elections, if any, have been other than simoniacal."

After all, some sceptic may arise who, on reading Mr. Trollope's diatribe, may doubt whether he, in his heart, regards the Pope and Cardinals with that contempt which his words about them seem to insinuate. In the first place, he does not understand them; and in the next place, perhaps, he hates them, and hatred is not always born of contempt, nor always the mother of it.

Mr. Trollope descends to particulars, and charges a Pope by name with the breaking of an oath deliberately taken. Of Gregory XII. he writes—and this information is for the "special student" probably—that "he promised also on oath in conclave to create no more Cardinals than such as should be sufficient to keep *his* College of Cardinals as numerous as that of the Antipope. But as soon as ever it became convenient for him to do so, he violated his oath, declaring that he was not guilty of any perjury because circumstances had changed since he made the promise" (p. 126).

In the first place it may be observed that a more equitable judge than Mr. Trollope would have hesitated to admit that the charge of perjury could be fairly sustained if "the circumstances had changed"; and in the second place, that a charge of perjury is a charge extremely difficult of proof, even when we have to deal with living men, and when all the facts of a story can be ascertained.

Happily, here the evidence is accessible, and the oath taken by Gregory XII. when he was Cardinal of S. Mark, and before his election to the sovereign Pontificate, has been preserved.

We shall take the clause relating to the creation of new Cardinals from a copy preserved, not by his friends, but by Theodorich von Niem, bishop of Verden, one of the persistent revilers of the saintly Pontiff.

Pendente tractatu unionis hujusmodi effectualiter et realiter ex utraque parte, non creabit nec faciet aliquem Cardinalem, nisi causa cœsequandi numerum sui sacri collegii cum numero prætensi collegii anticardinalium prædictorum, nisi ex defectu steterit adversæ partis quod unionis præfatæ conclusio infra annum a fine dictorum trium mensium non fuerit subsecuta: quo casu liceat eidem [Pontifici electo] Cardinales eligere ac creare, prout pro statu sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ eidem videbitur expedire."

The oath, then, taken by the Cardinals, if it could bind the Pope not then elected, bound him to create no Cardinals unless the number fell short of the number of those men whom the antipope called Cardinals. That is Mr. Trollope's account, but the truth is, as may be seen by the

oath itself, that the Pope to be elected was not bound in that way, but in this : within three months of his coronation effectual means were to be had recourse to for the quenching of the schism, and then, if within a year after the expiry of those three months the schism was not ended, the creation of Cardinals was not barred by the terms of the oath.

It is not necessary here to say that the Cardinals could not bind the Pope, for the facts themselves supply an answer to the causeless accusation brought against the memory of a great Pope. Gregory XII. was elected on the feast of S. Andrew, November 30th, 1406, and was crowned on the 19th day of December following. The schism was not put an end to, and fifteen months after his coronation he had created no Cardinal. He might have created a Cardinal on the 18th day of March, 1408, but he did not, and the first creation of Cardinals in his reign was that of the 9th day of May, 1408, and one of the Cardinals then created was afterwards the Pope Eugenius IV.

Mr. Trollope discourses very sagely on the story of the Council of Constance, by which Council, according to him :—

“All continuity with the traditional past is wholly and definitely severed. And though, Martin having been elected, it was thought fit to return with all possible accuracy into the old grooves, and to speak and act as though no continuity had been broken, nothing can be more indisputable than that the legitimacy of the whole scheme and constitution of ecclesiastical government thenceforward reposed on the innate authority of a self-constituted general Council” (p. 120).

This learned canonist, having revealed to us the failure of the Church, in the loss of the divine jurisdiction by which she is ordered, does not leave us without consolation, for he immediately adds : “No better ground according to the veritable nature of things and of a constituted Church can be imagined.” This great doctor, clearly, is of opinion that a human arrangement is better than the order which our Blessed Lord established.

In a note upon this wonderful passage he has these words :—

“Gregory did not refuse to recognize and submit to the Council [of Constance] considered, not as summoned by John, but as a spontaneous meeting of the Bishops of the universal Church.”

That does not mend matters, for if Gregory XII. submitted to the “spontaneous meeting of the Bishops,” he recognized their supremacy and abdicated his own ; and we have, therefore, according to Mr. Trollope, a confession made by the Pope that the Bishops assembled are the masters of the Pope.

If Mr. Trollope had a little more respect for “the general reader” he would not have thus surprised the “special student.” The fact is that Gregory XII. paid no heed to the “spontaneous meeting,” for he summoned directly himself a general Council, to be held in Constance, and his legates published the summons and then held the Council. Gregory XII. recognized no Council but that which he had summoned, and even to that he did not submit. He resigned the Popedom by the mouth of his Legate, *in* the Council, but not *to* the Council : for even then he took special

and distinct care to maintain the sovereign jurisdiction of the Holy See over all Councils whatsoever.

The following passage will show more plainly than we can do by any words of ours the true worth of Mr. Trollope's book, and his sense of the matters which he has so irreverently discussed. We are almost sorry to quote it, but as Mr. Gladstone has already proclaimed his own ignorance, we can hardly be guilty of detraction in repeating that which now everybody may know: but it is not necessary to suppose that he is quite as ignorant as Mr. Trollope.

"The intricate details of the vexed question to which the proceedings of the Council of Constance have led, and of the all important bearing of them on the contemporary controversy to which the unprecedented pretensions and claims of the present Pontiff have given rise, cannot be held to belong to a story of the Papal Conclaves, and would lead us into fields much too far away from our subject. The facts of the case, as well as the bearing of them on the claims advanced in accordance with the decrees of the late Vatican Council, have been as succinctly as lucidly set forth in Mr. Gladstone's tract 'on the Vatican Council and the Infallibility of the Pope,' and may there be read by those who are interested in the subject" (p. 130).

The Jesuits: their Constitution and Teaching. An Historical Sketch. By W. C. CARTWRIGHT, M.P. London: John Murray, 1876.

Remarks on a late Assailant of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns and Oates, 1875.

"**D**EBRETT informs us that Mr. Cartwright is one of the members for Oxfordshire, and adds that he "has the reputation of being highly accomplished in ancient and mediæval art and literature." A few years ago Mr. Cartwright published a now forgotten work on Papal Conclaves; he has returned to the field of ecclesiastical studies and produced a book on the Jesuits. Unfortunately for the member for Oxfordshire the Jesuits are neither an ancient nor a mediæval institution, and so Mr. Cartwright's doubtless extensive acquaintance with the literature and art of the pre-reformation period has availed him but little, and he has accordingly produced a very weak and unsatisfactory work.

Indeed, Mr. Cartwright's book would probably have attracted very little attention but for the circumstances of its origin. It first appeared in the form of two articles in the "Quarterly Review."* These articles called forth a very able reply in the columns of the "Month," which we are glad to see reprinted as a separate pamphlet. The reviewer in the "Month" very properly refused to follow Mr. Cartwright into all the details of thrice-refuted charges, revived, or rather repeated, with no pretence of originality, but he examined and criticised the argument sufficiently closely to demonstrate Mr. Cartwright's incompetence for his self-assumed task,

* (1.) The Jesuits: "Quart. Rev." Oct., 1874. (2.) The Doctrines of the Jesuits: "Quart. Rev.," January, 1875.

convicting him of carelessness, of mistranslation from his authorities, and of, we trust, unintentional misrepresentation of many portions of his case. In some points, and in some only, Mr. Cartwright has availed himself of the "Month's" criticisms. Most of our readers have probably seen the articles either in the "Month," or as reprinted in the pamphlet cited at the head of this notice. There is, therefore, no need that we should refer to the details of the work before us.

When a candidate presents himself for admission to the Society of Jesus, he is asked (as Ravignan tells us) whether he is willing to suffer, for the love of God, "contumely, slander, insult."* Books like Mr. Cartwright's give the sons of St. Ignatius ample opportunities for fulfilling their promise to bear all this. There seems to be a perfect tradition of anti-Jesuit literature. Mr. Cartwright is no Pascal, his pages are wofully dull reading; but he does little more than say again what Pascal said, and what a hundred men have copied from him since, and what a hundred more will copy as time goes on. The strange thing is that writers like Mr. Cartwright profess to tell us all about the Jesuits; and yet, so far as we can discover, he knows nothing of the Society except from books. He writes as if he was reconstructing from dead records the history of a dead and half-forgotten organization. It seems never to occur to him that the men he is assailing are living here amongst us in England and Ireland, and in their schools and their churches influencing the lives of thousands. Mr. Cartwright would have us believe that the teaching of the Jesuits is sapping the first principles of morality. By implication, therefore, he strives to attach a stigma to the hundreds of his fellow-subjects, and a man who does this deliberately should support his charge with a greater show of proof.

When a man ignorant of the first principles of a written law attempts its interpretation, with the set purpose of proving that it is essentially evil, it is not to be wondered at that he should involve himself in a host of errors. What would be the fate of a man who, without ever having pursued legal studies, would undertake to write a slashing commentary on English law? Yet, a worse fate awaits the man who analyses in a review article, as Mr. Cartwright has done, a treatise on moral theology, which he only opens in order to look for damnatory evidence against the Society which has given it its approbation.

Mr. Cartwright speaks of the wonderful complicity of the Jesuit organization. It is really remarkably simple and practical. Ravignan's little brochure would teach Mr. Cartwright more about the Jesuits and their organization than he has gathered from his abstruse studies in anti-Jesuit literature, and we could point out an article of two or three columns in a popular English Encyclopædia that puts this "complex organization" in a very clear and simple light, and makes us think that, after all, it cannot be so very difficult to understand how the Society is governed. We had thought that the belief in the existence of secret affiliation and of crypto-

* Pro ipsius amore ac reverentia. . . . contumelias falsa et injurias pati.

Jesuits was exploded long ago. Mr. Cartwright has undeceived us. He believes in these fables—a belief shared, perhaps, by the member for Peterborough.

As an example of the spirit in which Mr. Cartwright writes, let us take his interpretation of what he is pleased to call “the mystic letters, A.M.D.G.”

“Wonderfully supple as may be the mechanism of the Society of Jesus,” he says, “it yet constitutes the mere skeleton of a system that derives animation from essences of doctrine too subtle to be compressed within the bounds of palpable provisions. Of such essences there exists but one visible symbol, the mystic letters, A.M.D.G. (*Ad maiorem Dei gloriam*), conspicuously emblazoned as a sacred sign on the frontispiece of every work, structure, or creation with which the order acknowledges itself to be identified. Through the motto abbreviated into these four initial letters, the Society of Jesus ostentatiously advertises itself as being in possession of a superior knowledge in Divine things, that can furnish means of specific efficacy for insuring the upward progress of humanity towards such a state of purified existence as will be capable of reflecting the bright imagery of God’s enhanced glorification.”

We question very much if Mr. Cartwright knows exactly what he means by this passage.* His explanation of the “mystic letters” is certainly conveyed in mystic words.

There is one error on a point of fact from which we should have thought an ordinary course of newspaper reading would have served the author. He tells us that the Abbé Passaglia was one of those who “knocked at the door of the Society,” and was refused admission. When Passaglia left the Society he was a professor in the Roman College. An error like this is in itself unimportant, but it shows the carelessness of the writer.

Of the glorious work that the Society has done Mr. Cartwright says nothing. He tells us not of the missions of the East and West, of the Apostolic men who were at once the evangelizers of nations and the pioneers of civilization, nor does he say a word of the heroic deaths of the martyrs of the Society. Were these men the disciples of an immoral system of minimising and conscience deceiving? Mr. Cartwright is like an astronomer who would look at the sun, and look only for spots, and when he saw, or thought he saw, a spot, proclaim that the sun was a black dull mass.

* Even in these few lines Mr. Cartwright errs in a point of fact. Our impression is that most Jesuit books bear on their title-pages not the letters A.M.D.G., but the letters I.H.S. and the cross, which also appear on the fronts of many foreign Jesuit colleges.

Daniel Deronda. By GEORGE ELIOT. London : Blackwood & Sons, 1876.

NO apology will be deemed necessary, by those at least who have studied George Eliot's pages, for seeking in them the chapters of a living philosophy. They claim likewise, and some may be apt to think they claim in the first place, to be productions of art ; but the Platonic dialogues were such, all true poetry is such ; and yet Plato and the poets would censure our want of just conceptions were we to deny them deep and universal thought, or to miss in them the light of pure reason because they have disclosed its beauty when refracted through the glass of the imagination. Indeed, some kind of art must, from the nature of our understanding, be perceptible in science itself and in abstract discussion ; for the most systematic arrangement of truth depends, partly, on the character of the man who designs it, and where the facts are simplest there must remain a possibility of grouping them in various ways. But we are not called upon to speak of George Eliot as an excelling artist ; still less can her recent volumes submit to be treated as though it were a question of a novel or any similar piece of literature. Their author has aimed at something better than fiction, and more severe in its immediate requirements. Following out the maxims of her theory, she has given form and colour to certain ideal principles, and has gained attention from many who do not speculate, by the promise of an entertainment which they very willingly seek--the pleasure of incident and catastrophe. And we should say the promise is kept ; for the *dramatis personæ* are striking, acute special observations and passages of mental history abound ; there is also a rare but vividly natural description of beautiful scenery. As for the story, it is so well wrought out, so rounded off, and glows with such a genial warmth of romance, though it is a story of modern life, that the merely curious, by skipping a page here and there, and leaving the Jewish prophet, Mordecai, to the solitude of his own reflections, may rise with a feeling of perfect content when they have reached the end of the fourth volume. For our part, we, too, admire the narrative and the form ; but the chief object of our reading has been the morality, the lessons proposed for our instruction and enlargement of view. Earnest words, which are the expression of a supremely gifted mind, are not likely to die away upon the echo ; they will make or find a home for themselves in the breasts of the young certainly, and, perhaps, of some others ; they will have consequences. But consequences of what sort ?

Three characters in the book have allotted to them the part of an ancient Greek chorus. They interpret the events which pass, and disengage from them their symbolic value, which, if there were no pause in the action, might be overlooked. And as the tragic or comic writer meant his chorus to utter what he himself felt and believed, so we must imagine that these personages give us the convictions of George Eliot ; nay, it is apparent that she does not wish to stand away from her creations, as Goethe used to in his passion for "objective beauty" ; she composes with undisguised enthusiasm, though it is finely subdued to the measure of her art. These

three, then, who are at once dramatic and choral, are the hero, Daniel Deronda, the Hebrew student Mordecai, and the very womanly woman Gwendolen Harleth. Each of these may be said to bring into relief a principle or doctrine, and so far reminds us of the figures in Calderon's "*Autos Sacramentales*"; but Gwendolen and Mordecai are represented as acting on the full, yet somewhat passive, nature (really passive we incline to think, in spite of the author's wish that we should think otherwise) of Deronda. The two principles, incessantly preached in a tone now of beseeching, and now of protestation, are the absolute sovereignty of conscience and the absolute need to human progress of national and family tradition. These are united in the life of Daniel Deronda himself—in the coincidences and combinations which at length restore him to a place amongst his people and determine his vocation,—by means of a third principle, the law of Providence (we do not know how else rightly to describe it) which defeats and overrules the evil will of such characters as the Princess, Deronda's mother, and Mirah Cohen's father. Thus the story is in condemnation of an age which, for the most part, has loosened the bonds of tradition everywhere, has released, in private life, the so-called educated classes from any other law than their own caprice, and has blasphemed the Divine influence which governs the world by esteeming it to be, not a Providence, but an irresistible Fate—a blind and mechanical impulse of motion, when it is, in truth, a power that takes account of man's "loyalty of choice and discernment," that requires of him to open a pathway for events, but does not drive him onward against his will.

Contrary to the prevailing fashion, which does not acknowledge heroes, the central figure of the book is meant for a hero of the now-forgotten type. Daniel Deronda has come of the race of Israel, and of its noblest stock; unconsciously to himself he possesses by inheritance the tradition of sympathy, suffering, and wisdom (for it exceeds modern knowledge in height, whilst at least equalling it in breadth), which has been fostered by "a national tragedy lasting for fifteen hundred years, in which the poets and the actors were also the heroes." His mother, dowered with genius and pride, would have delivered him from the contempt, as she says, "which pursues Jewish separateness," by casting him off and placing him where he might seem an English gentleman, and cease to be a stranger to the society of ordinary men. But he has not known how to stoop so low; he cannot put faith in the sectarian Liberalism of his guardian, Sir Hugo Malinger, and his Conservative veneration for the past is thoughtful and tender, since he has no personal interests that could make him selfish. With a capacity for examining and criticising which might tempt him to relish Voltaire, he unites the enthusiasm of mediæval chivalry. He cannot divest himself of sympathies, such as arise of their own accord in one who endeavours to look at all causes and movements through eyes that were partial to them; and this it is that saves him from the spirit of excessive criticism; for George Eliot protests openly against that laboriously ignorant knowledge which can tell you everything about the truth, except the truth itself. Deronda, at first, has only a vague and undeveloped, though certainly an attractive, nature to show us; he meditates a great deal and

lives over the scenes of history in himself ; but when he should be entering on the duties of manhood, he finds that he has no settled position, and no vocation to any career in which he might realize his aspirations after good. The plot of the story turns upon those events which, as Goethe so happily expressed it, change his capacities into acquisitions, by leading him home to his own race, and obliging him to the privileged task of co-operation with others for the fulfilment of their destiny. In Mordecai he has discovered a man of creative and regenerating ideas, and though Mordecai has resigned himself to die before they are accomplished, Deronda promises, not indeed to execute the letter of them, but to carry on the vital succession by which parable and shadow get transformed into enduring realities. Thus the lesson is enforced over and over again, that merely personal genius can be of small account, and needs the sustaining help of a great tradition, of a local habitation and an historic creed.

But whilst Deronda, in his relations with Mordecai, appears as a disciple, to Gwendolen Harleth he is like an embodied conscience, the personified ideal of right in its mingled sweetness and majesty, the absolute categorical imperative which commands and forbids, and from which there is no appeal. The contrast and the resemblance between these two, unquestionably first in interest of all the characters depicted, is well worth studying. When the history begins, Deronda has only the inner voice to direct him, and forms of religion and society exercise no influence that need be taken into consideration, on his true life. And Gwendolen, though she has been taught the conventional phrases with regard to duty, is unable to discern their meaning or to apply them to her own difficulties. The one has a traditional sense of right and wrong, for his ancestors have clung to their own creed, and have prized it the more in proportion as they were called on to suffer for it. The other, brought up in a mere form, which has long since relinquished whatever vitality it may have had, scarcely knows that there is a law of conscience at all ; but she is awed when the great universe seems to press in upon her, she dreads retribution and punishment, though her feeling has in it nothing distinct or dogmatic, and is rather an apprehension of what may be than of what must be. The thought of duty prevails always with Deronda ; but Gwendolen (except in those moments of shadowy terror) has resolved that her own will and good pleasure shall win for her a position where everything may seem enjoyable. She admirably typifies the struggle of self-will against the moral law ; and her inexperience makes her believe that by sheer force of will the law is to be conquered. But religion, or at least conscience, has the promise of victory on its side as soon as the truth dawns upon the unhappy creature that caprice is itself a law, and that whatever step we take binds us to another. Then Deronda, whose disapprobation has once before smitten her pride and reproved her silently, comes upon the scene ; and, as we have said, he fulfils an office like that of some lawgiver or prophet. Gwendolen does not know how to resist this new and strange power which bears witness against her, and she wishes only that it may allow her some peace. She has done wrong, she has attempted to turn the loss of another into her own gain by an iniquitous

marriage, and her misery and remorse enlightened, occasionally and fitfully, through the wise words of Deronda, whom she has compelled to hear her confession (as the author herself puts it), at length teach her that the universe is ruled according to the law of conscience, and that the only human happiness consists in loving and cleaving to the right. Her penance is severe, though not hopeless, for she is entering on a path which leads upwards to light and love; but, so far as the ordinary goods and graces of life are concerned, these seem to be denied her, and the close of her history, as told by George Eliot, is a tragic renouncement. This is, in many respects, so true to nature and art, and is executed with such exceeding tenderness and delicacy, that, whatever becomes of the remainder of the book, we anticipate for this part an almost immortality of fame. Elsewhere the author indulges herself in scientific language, but here she is simple, touching, and delightful: the best thoughts she has written, we dare to say, are those which every one can understand. It was a noble enterprise to describe for us the awakening of a conscience, and though all has not been said, yet we can accept much of the history as solidly true and real. Nothing is so terrible as to look upon a soul, but nothing is more necessary if we would learn things as they are; and we have in these pages the features of the soul revealed in part as only a master-spirit could reveal them.

We seem to have said hardly anything, but Daniel Deronda is not easily criticised in a few words. It would remain to note some of its defects; but these are familiar enough, we do not say to readers of George Eliot, but to students of Positivism. Is there an ever-living God, the foundation of morality and its great reward? May we hope that the good in us shall have its fruition and perfect development in another, the perfect universe? Or must we, accepting the vocation to do right and eschew evil, be content, when our day is over, to pass out of sight for ever? Does virtue mean self-sacrifice, and not the beginning of an eternal consummation and securely-possessed excellence? Is there any unchangeable form of religious truth extant amongst men, unchangeable because God, the All-perfect, has chosen to make it known? These are questions which Catholics answer in one way, and Positivists in another. George Eliot, alas, is no Catholic. She says, with an unconscious pathos, that the very best of human possibilities is "the blending of a complete personal love in one current with a larger duty," and she does not know that such a blending can never be, except in the love and service of the Incarnate Word of God. So near is she to the truth, and so far off from it! Morality, and tradition, and Providence, are all made clear to us in the teaching of the living and divinely-guided Church: in the doctrine of Positivism they may find a place, but they will bring no consolation.

History of the Childhood of Jesus, after the Four Gospels. By JOSEPH GRIMM, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Würzburg, Ratisbon : Pustet. 1876.

PROFESSOR GRIMM intends to publish an entire life of Our Lord on the plan which he has begun to execute in the present volume. Of the method and principles which are requisite for the composition of a Gospel-harmony he has treated at some length ; but this is in a previous work, which has not come into our hands. However, there is quite enough in the volume now sent us for review to warrant our saying that he has every prospect of doing signal and important service to religion in Germany, by his plain but very instructive commentary upon the sacred narrative. How difficult is the enterprise of writing a satisfactory life of Christ we need not point out ; but since it calls, at least, for a union of great genius with sagacious and entirely Catholic piety, we should long hesitate before assuring ourselves that the enterprise in any given instance had been a success. Dr. Grimm has written in the most excellent spirit of piety and faith. His book is a very good one, and bears frequent trace of the learning and study expended upon it. But we cannot call it perfect, so far ; and whilst we are sure it will have an influence for good, we do not rise from the perusal of it with unalloyed satisfaction. There is too much in it, and too little. The Introduction, which is a brief summary of the Old Testament history, appears to us in England a mere superfluity. We should be thankful, indeed, for a preliminary sketch of the Jewish polity and manners at the time our Blessed Lord came—such, we mean, as Döllinger has drawn in the wonderful book “On the Gentile and the Jew,” but, naturally, different in spirit. This, however, is not offered us. Again, there seems a redundancy in several parts, a making much of trite reflections, which entails parsimony where much could have been profitably said. The comments upon the Magnificat and the Benedictus are far too short and simple.

The author's success in meeting difficulties, and suggesting the explanation of obscure passages, will, of course, be judged differently by different persons. We incline to think he makes too light of modern criticism, and does not care to ask himself searching questions. At the same time, he gives valuable and interesting information on certain points : we would mention the genealogies of Our Lord, the marriage of Our Lady and S. Joseph, and the journey of the Three Kings to Bethlehem. An excursus upon the signification of the holy name of Mary is well worth reading, and somewhat curious ; but we fancy there is a great deal to be gathered out of the ancient writers which Dr. Grimm has overlooked.

The style is neither laboured nor careless ; but such as to engage the reader's attention and not fatigue him. Now and then, it is, perhaps, a little out of keeping with the simplicity which, we venture to suppose, is the becoming only style in a history founded on Scripture. We seem to catch a reminiscence of F. Faber at times, though, of course, the picturesque details

would occur to any one whose object was to depict the scenes and incidents of Bethlehem and Nazareth. A good criterion may be suggested by which to judge of the whole book without exhibiting passages from it. We have only to set it by the side of the beautifully-tender and meditative *Life of Our Lord* which Ludolphus de Saxonia has bequeathed to the world. The measure of difference will be the measure of excellence in the ancient writer. The modern abounds in description and reflection, but there are wanting the supernatural sweetness, the freshness, the unfailing spirit of consolation which make it a pleasure even to remember Ludolphus. The two books do not, it is true, appeal to quite the same disposition of mind. Neither would we for a moment deny the clearness, vigour, and steady sense of the author whom we are noticing. But our expectations upon opening Dr. Grimm's volume have not been wholly realized; we could have preferred a touch of the antique and medieval which, here at least would never have detracted from the religious worth.

History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century. By LESLIE STEPHEN. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

THE author of these volumes is known, we dare not say favourably, for his frankness in avowing the religious creed called Agnosticism. But though of a speculative turn, as many pages in his new work testify, he has bestowed careful attention on the history of men and letters in England; and we may, perhaps, venture to say that he thinks of doing a service to his own cause by presenting some views of the past which have hitherto escaped notice. Every one remembers how the "philosophers" of the eighteenth century did not choose to write up their doctrine, as others had done, by formal treatise and disquisition, but, in imitation of Bayle, kept on publishing histories, memoirs, biographies, and above all, dictionaries of general information, from behind which they fought, as though defended by an intrenchment. To have argued out a philosophy was no ambition of theirs: in fact, it would have proved their ruin. But to write history on a plan, to be ever biassed without making any confession of their principles, to act the critic when it was impossible to expatiate on their proper belief, this they found a safe and effectual method of attack. It has, indeed, great advantages, chiefly because the imagination, which is dormant in philosophy, awakes into vigour when the subject introduced is the life of a whole generation. And we may be sure that there is more danger to the faith, and generally to Christian principles, in works of history, of literature, and of the mixed sciences, than in pure theorizing like that of Kant or Spinoza, especially where the audience does not care at all for the merely abstract, but has a healthy, English love of reality and circumstance. We cannot tell whether Mr. Stephen is likely to draw many readers, and nothing would induce us to hope that he may; but he has done his utmost to preach a doctrine of the

widest scope and consequence, and he has done that in a seemingly harmless and, of course, very impartial review of a century which has great characters and great events to endow it with interest. Before going into further detail, we are bound to say that the book, in spirit and tendency, is one of the worst we have ever been obliged to read. And yet Mr. Stephen, to judge from what he writes, is a man of refined and gentle sentiments; he would appear to shrink from hurting any creature alive. Pity he does not make account of the many whom his reflections are calculated to tempt, not merely away from religion, but into despair. He would, perhaps, call himself humane, but he has sent out a cruel book into the world.

This was likely to be the case, considering that the best exposition of Mr. Stephen's own mind must be sought in Hume's Essays. The entire two volumes are an application of the sceptical doubt to philosophy, religion, ethics, political economy, poetry, literature, and social phenomena in general. Hume would have written in almost the same mood of lettered indifference, but he could not have thus arranged or presented the materials simply because at his day German criticism had only put forth its first leaves. Mr. Stephen looks at the eighteenth century with the eyes of the nineteenth: he has joined to the Epicurean infidelity of Hume the Hegelian sense of historical development and of organic influences. Hence the multitude of collected facts, the minuteness of detail, the rich, almost too rich combination of separate studies into one view; and hence, the truth and excellence of various detached passages. But if we must think of the whole as such, and of the purpose it is meant to serve, there need hardly be the hesitation of a moment before concluding that Mr. Stephen deserves a place on the moral Index as another of the contemporary prophets who are preaching death and not life, despair of good, and a careless temper towards evil. It is remarkable that, now and then, he falls into a light vein which reminds us of Hume and Voltaire, and is a contrast to his solemnity of phrase when he gathers up an argument against Theism from the misery and sinfulness of mankind. The levity, we cannot but believe, is unsuited to this subject; it is not so much irony as irreligion, and may indicate that the writer, having overtaxed his conscience, has not now a very keen perception of what we mean by "reverence."

Throughout he assumes that he is taking an impartial review, not only of the Deists and other enemies to religion, but of Christians too. He gives himself credit for understanding men like Butler and Clarke, with whom we may safely say he has few or no sympathies. That he has read the authors we know; but has he given his mind to their arguments? has he taken, for instance, the whole of Clarke's philosophy, and attempted to grasp the bearing of one part on another? If so, we cannot esteem his powers of speculation quite as he does himself. From time to time, one is forced to say that Mr. Stephen has lacked the patience to meditate upon his books: that he has not always cared to go along with a man who differs from his own theory. We have no space to give examples; but there are still many who have learned Bishop Butler by heart, so to speak, and they will be very slow to grant that Mr. Stephen has rightly appreci-

ated his meaning. The same thing is true, though not to the same degree of those who wrote upon Natural Religion against the Deists. It may well be that Protestants could not rise to that sublime contemplation which is the fruit of the supernatural virtues practised in the Church,—of detachment, virginity, and obedience. They were oftentimes gross in their manner of speaking, because they had sunk to a lower level of spiritual perfection, but why not penetrate to the *meaning* of their words? They had a narrow conception of the universe; but in philosophy the question turns upon essence, not upon degree, and a philosopher should never lose that out of sight. When Mr. Stephen amuses himself over their human thoughts concerning the Deity he supposes that they thought no better than they said, and that they would have maintained their expressions to be adequate. Not surely they who asserted that the excellence of God is infinite, that He is incomprehensible, that the full knowledge of Him is reserved for the life to come. Mr. Stephen argues captiously, and will not suffer the least imperfection of speech when a Christian philosopher is speaking, and yet it has ever been a dogma of faith that no man can speak worthily of God, because He transcends every created intellect. To forget this is like studying geometry without its axioms. At the same time, we have often thought that Protestant defenders of religion, whether natural or revealed, do afford a purchase to the unbeliever by the real agreement which exists between some of their principles and some of his: and, again, they miss the explanation of a variety of difficulties by refusing to accept the Catholic truths which make the whole consistent and well-balanced. Instances occur in several of the great authors, and, as Mr. Stephen rightly enough observes, there is an occasional exhibition of doctrine by Christian apologists which an intelligent Deist would not refuse to own.

Had we more space, we might very fairly illustrate the method pursued by Mr. Stephen—for his method is regular enough—by criticising his criticism of David Hume on the one side and William Law on the other. He gives paragraph after paragraph out of the Essays with the confidence of a man who cannot be answered. But we think we have seen a pretty complete answer both to the essayist and to his exponent in the writings of S. Thomas. At all events, we feel disposed to treat the chapter upon Hume as a not too plausible statement of fallacies. A wrong argument should be specious no less than sophistical. Perhaps it is only temperament, but we do not experience any peculiar distress, as we ought to do, in listening to Hume's objections. And, after all, why should we? According to Mr. Stephen, "a vague belief, too impalpable to be imprisoned in formula or condensed into demonstrations, still survived in his mind, suggesting that there must be something behind the veil, and something, perhaps, bearing a remote analogy to human intelligence." This from a coldly consummate logician is a proof that the most obstinate of sceptical reasoners cannot overcome his reason; it means that if he possessed another faculty—that of conscience—he would acknowledge the living God. Hume complains that in demonstrating the existence of God we take at our own good pleasure only one analogical view of the world. That is not true, for we argue to the First and Best from every grade of

essence and along every line of being ; but it is precisely what Hume does himself. He will be content with no proof unless it be drawn from entirely abstract premises ; and then he complains that it is all a piece of empty logic, because the forms of the mind are logical. So they are ; but the question remains, have they an ontological content or foundation ? We cannot profess to care nothing for the result in such a subject, and to that extent we are not impartial ; but Mr. Leslie has confirmed our belief that Hume is a sophist.

William Law he would admire as a writer, but he thinks it sufficient to call his philosophy mysticism, and so to put it on one side. In England this may be permissible : there is no doubt that the genius of Plato would have met with tardy recognition from our practical countrymen, whose way it is to dwell with Aristotle upon the mean and intermediate causes rather than upon the end with the Divine Philosopher and S. Augustine. But is it not a refutation of all the atheistic and agnostic difficulties to feel conquered, to be brought on one's knees, when a spiritual book like the "Imitation of Christ"—and Law's "Serious Call" is not entirely unworthy to be mentioned along with it—impresses thoughts from another world upon heart and mind together ? No one can have the least reverence for Hume ; no one can refuse reverence to the Imitation without feeling that he has degraded himself. William Law, though, unhappily, not a Catholic, was a man of ascetic life, and knew the soul and its experience ; he observed the conscience in its relation to the Divine Master, and the very greatness of his logical power and understanding obliged him to confess that there must be a first and absolute cause of the phenomena of saintliness, which are just as evident as those of magnetism. Hume had said, "How can you argue without facts to the existence of a fact or reality ?" Law answered, "Here are facts in abundance, and of a unique character. What do you make of them ?" The question has never been answered. Mr. Stephen does not precisely distort the arguments of Law ; but he gives them in such a manner that they seem far-fetched and illusory. We are not denying his right to do so if he chooses ; but we feel bound to warn the reader that the rhetorical setting is not necessary, and might, in fact, be entirely removed. If all theories and syntheses are doubtful, Mr. Stephen's is no better than ours, and we certainly cannot accept his judgment as final. On the contrary, we should not feel secure in going by his estimate even of Paley and Warburton, had we not the means of correcting it. He says very often what a Catholic might say of the ordinary Protestant, but we are not at all inclined to think that Mr. Leslie Stephen is more attractive than the ordinary Protestant. His chief defect is that he he makes light of moral goodness, knows nothing of humility, and has no fear of future judgment. It is scarcely a less serious fault that he extols pure intellect and literary ability, as though the perfect man were a critic or a so-called philosopher. This is the wisdom of the world, which, according to S. Paul, is folly, even when it speaks the purest Attic.

Solar Physics: a Lecture. By the Very Rev. J. B. KAVANAGH, D.D.,
President of Carlow College. Dublin: Joseph Dollard.

IN this pamphlet the Very Rev. the President of Carlow College gives a most clear, terse, interesting description of present knowledge and speculation respecting the sun. He has evidently mastered the facts of which he speaks, so as to obtain clear and distinct ideas of them, to turn them over in his mind, and make them assume new relations and present themselves under different aspects, and he possesses to a rare degree the gifts of an elegant style and of lucid and attractive exposition. In fact, his lecture is a most excellent one, and admirably adapted to fulfil the purpose for which it was intended,—to give an account, in concise and popular form, of some of the recent discoveries in solar physics. Some readers will perhaps think the speculations are stated a little too absolutely, while others may be affrighted at the copious introduction of numbers,—without which it is of course impossible to give an adequate idea of the subject described;—but no one will rise from the perusal of the lecture without feeling that his knowledge has been pleasantly increased and methodized.

The author begins by enumerating various endeavours which have been made to ascertain the sun's distance, and after briefly speaking of his magnitude and mass, introduces the subject of the solar forces in an impressive passage, part of which we quote (though of course it suffers in quotation by the loss of the context) as an example of his method of treatment:—

“Extend your glance over the whole earth; see the various forces exercised in the various countries of the world, in the animal and vegetable kingdoms; just think what a worker that sun must be. These forces have all their equivalent in heat, and are but another form of it; and all heat comes from the sun. The most distinguished investigator of the dynamical value of muscular energy is your townsman Dr. Haughton. . . . Not a blade of grass springs up except by the action of solar force; not an ear of corn ripens in your fields except by the same wonderful power; not a tree, nor plant, nor flower blooms upon the earth except by the direct action of the sun's actinic force . . . The winds that blow are the effects of solar heat; the cyclonic storms and tornadoes of the tropics are manifestations of his wonderful power. The rush of the cataract, the roar of the ocean and the surging of the billow, are but other forms in which solar force is exhibited and solar heat expended. The sun lifts up from the ocean millions and millions of tons of water. . . . The force required to produce one inch of rainfall over this small county would be equal to 27,900,000 foot tons. What, then, must be the enormous force required to produce all the rain which falls over the whole surface of the earth for an entire year; nay, for thousands and thousands of years in succession? Not only do we owe to solar force the fertilizing shower, but his power alone holds all the waters of the globe in their fluid state. The sun has invested in every pound of water a force equivalent to 80 units of heat, which is equivalent to a mechanical effort of 50 foot tons; and if this force, which the sun has permanently concealed in preserving the waters in their fluid state, were

withdrawn, the seas, and rivers, and oceans would become one vast mass of ice, and all organized life would be destroyed on the surface of the earth. In every pound of vapour in the atmosphere the sun has a latent force of 536 units of heat, which, in mechanical force is equal to 305½ foot tons; and though we do not know with scientific accuracy the latent heat of the two principal gases which form the atmosphere, it is quite certain their latent heat exceeds that of steam. We may, therefore, safely assume that the sun has stored up, in every pound of the atmosphere, 536 units of heat; and as every column of atmosphere which has one square inch for its base weighs 15 lb., the sun has, in such column, 8,040 units of heat, which is equal to a mechanical force of nearly 5,000 foot tons. . . . The actinic force of the sun, too, produces those chemical compositions and decompositions which are continually active on the earth's surface; and by the detrition of rocks and the transport of materials by oceanic currents, the sun has deposited these vast formations of stratified rocks, which are piled up miles and miles on each other, and has also formed the strata of the Carboniferous period, where his light and heat are so abundantly stored.

"The solar force received upon the earth is but the smallest fraction of a similar force which the sun radiates into every part of interplanetary space. The effects of solar force are produced on all the planets, if the terrestrial conditions are present. The portion of solar force received upon the earth, vast as it is, is infinitely small, compared with the whole amount of solar radiation. If you conceive a hollow sphere whose radius is 92 millions of miles, to every point in the surface of that sphere the sun sends light, heat, and actinic force, and what reaches the earth are only the few rays which fall on the comparatively small space which a great circle of the earth occupies on the surface of that vast sphere. According to Mr. Croll's interesting calculations, 83·4 foot pounds of heat per second fall on every square foot of the earth's surface exposed to the perpendicular rays of the sun, and the quantity which falls on a foot of the earth's surface is to the quantity radiated from a foot of the sun's surface as the square of the sun's radius is to the square of the sun's distance, therefore 3,869,000 foot pounds of heat are radiated every second from every square foot of the sun's surface, and there are radiated per year the enormous number of 8,340,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 [834 × 10¹⁷] foot pounds. To maintain this rate of radiation would require the combustion 1,500 pounds of coal per second on every square foot of the sun's surface; and if the sun were a mass of coal, he would be consumed in 5,000 years."

Dr. Kavanagh then proceeds to speak of the physical conditions of whose continued existence in the sun the persistent exercise of these forces is the result, and describes the history—a much controverted subject—and nature of spectrum analysis, by which the chemical constitution of the central body of our system has been to a certain extent made manifest. He indicates the principal facts known about the several parts of the sun is composed, subjoining his own opinions and suggestions. The central nucleus,—if that can be called a nucleus which probably bears about the same proportion to the total bulk of the sun as the fluid contents of an egg bear to that of the egg,—is not, he thinks, gaseous; his reason being that, if it were so, it would be transparent. This dark nucleus is surrounded by a shell of gaseous matter, "which may be volatilized matter in a state of imperfect combustion." Then comes the

photosphere, the source of the whole (broadly speaking) of the solar light, which is an envelope of gaseous matter in a state of intense incandescence. This is surrounded by the fainter and more irregular chromosphere, a sea of coloured flame of so faint a luminosity, that without the employment of special methods, it could be seen only in eclipses. This is again enclosed by the corona, a much thicker shell (its outer limit is, indeed, indefinite), which may, he thinks, be caused by meteoric matter floating in the region of the sun, and raised to incandescence by rapid motion through his atmosphere. Finally, before passing to enumerate and evaluate the opinions held as to the cause of the solar heat and light, he describes the phenomena of sun-spots, of which he gives the ordinary explanation, that they are solar cyclones due to difference of temperature between poles and equator.

The lecture concludes by giving some account of the various theories just referred to. The greatest stress is apparently laid on Helmholtz's theory, which supposes that the solar system was at first a mass of nebulous matter, and that its heat is due to its contraction,—diminution of volume being a well-known source of heat. Meyer and Sir William Thompson's theory, that the heat is due to the impact of meteoric masses, is given, but not made much of. Other theories are also mentioned; and the author concludes by a passage in which he applies them to the solution of the question how long the sun has been giving forth heat, and how long he can continue to do so; but declines to decide between them:—

“The work of condensation would supply solar heat, at the present rate of radiation, for about twenty and one half millions of years. But this time is altogether insufficient for the geologists, who vindicate to our earth a much higher antiquity? Whence, then, are we to derive the vast stores of solar heat which geological time requires, if we are to accept the theory of Playfair, Sir Charles Lyell, and their recent admirers? The former calculation supposed that there was no heat in the nebulous mass when condensation commenced—a most improbable supposition, for it must have been preserved in its gaseous form by the repulsive power of heat. If we suppose, therefore, that the nebulous mass cooling under pressure would give off as much original heat as atmospheric air, or any perfect gas, the proportion of original heat given off is to the quantity of heat generated by condensation, as 234 foot pounds is to 95 foot pounds. If we work out this proposition, we find that the original heat of the solar nebula gives a supply of solar heat at the present rate of radiation for 50 millions of years. Adding this to the heat of condensation, we get a supply of solar heat for seventy and one half millions of years. If this term is insufficient for the geologists, we must suppose that the residuum of 30 millions of years still required is supplied by the meteoric theory of Meyer, to which we have previously referred; or we must suppose with Croll, that the original solar nebula was formed by two masses of matter colliding in space with such velocity as to develop the requisite quantity of heat; or we can invoke Father Secchi's theory of the heat evolved by the union of bodies in a state of dissociation at the surface of the sun. Which of these rival theories is the true one, or whether all may not combine to preserve solar radiation undiminished, I will not presume to decide.”

Correspondence.

PROFESSOR MIVART.

To the Editor of the "DUBLIN REVIEW."

SIR,—Your Reviewer has, in my judgment, misrepresented me so gravely that I owe it to myself to make the following affirmations, which I shall be obliged if you will insert in your next publication:—

1. I have never held, and therefore certainly have never promulgated "the doctrine that a state cannot without tyranny and injustice, prohibit any given citizen from freely propagating any given tenets concerning religion and morality which he sincerely believes to be true."

2. I have never held nor promulgated "that the state cannot without tyranny and injustice offer any impediment in the way of such an enterprise," as the diffusion of a belief that "free-love and murder of the sick and old are laudable habits," and that "the English law could not now justly punish persons for conspiring to propagate such a belief."

3. I have never thought, and consequently have never said, "that the State would act tyrannically and unjustly, if it punished the proselytizing advocates of free-love and murder."

4. I have never made any such "proposal" as it is stated * that I have made, and my abhorrence of such practices as have been imagined by your reviewer, is fully as great as that which he can himself entertain, and any such "proposal" is as repugnant to my feelings as it is opposed to my reason.

The above propositions I have never enunciated.

If the reviewer believes them to be contained in my premisses, he is of course at liberty to draw them out, but he cannot with justice charge them upon me. I do not believe them to be contained in my premisses, and as I have said, I abhor them at least as much as the reviewer can.

I emphatically repudiate the representation that my attitude is one atom less opposed to Atheism, than when I wrote my "Lessons from Nature." Such a representation is very offensive to me, for I count it one of my highest honours to defend the cause of Theism.

As to the "three principles" which the reviewer believes me to have implied, I altogether deny that such inferences can justly be deduced from my words as it has been sought to deduce, and I also deny that anything I have written, in my belief and intention, swerves even a hair's breadth from the declarations of the Syllabus or of the Vatican Council, as to

* Page 24.

which I have before distinctly said,* "I feel no difficulty whatever," and to which I ex animo submit.

There are many other points on which, in my judgment, the reviewer has gravely misunderstood, and therefore misrepresented me, but they are too numerous for recital, and would need so full a re-statement that I forbear to enumerate them.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

WILMSHURST, UCKFIELD, *April 2, 1877.*

[We publish the preceding letter with sincere gratification. Our conviction of course is that we have not misrepresented Dr. Mivart; nor (so far as regards the objective sense of his words) misunderstood him. But we feel that we need offer no justification of our logical accuracy. Our readers are in possession of the controversy, and can form their own judgment. We had as little intention to do wrong to Dr. Mivart, as we are sure he had to contravene Catholic teaching. We have never for a moment doubted that—as we said in January—he is "honestly full of loyal intentions towards the Church and the Holy See."]

* DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1876, p. 563.

INDEX.

ALLARD (M. Paul) *Les Esclaves Chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'Eglise jusqu'à la fin de la domination Romaine en Occident, noticed, 270.*

Ameyclanus. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Results of Electricity and Magnetism, noticed, 233.*

APPENDIX TO OUR OCTOBER ARTICLE ON THE RESURRECTION, 220-228.

APPENDIX TO THE FIRST ARTICLE OF OUR JANUARY NUMBER, 503-506.

AUGUSTINE DE BACKER (F.), 452-472: a guide wanted to the extensive literature of the Jesuits, 452; Ribedaneira's Catalogue, 453; D'Alegambe's and Southwell's works, 454; continuation by Oudin, Zaccaria, and Caballero, 455; the early life of Augustine de Backer, 457; he is obliged to go to France, and afterwards to Switzerland, to procure a religious education, 457; returning to Antwerp he takes part in the revolution, and is obliged to flee, 458; his brother Charles joins the Jesuits, 459; Augustine enters the Society, 460; he commences a Bibliography of the works of the Order, 460; the treasures of the Jesuit Libraries in the Low Countries, 461; they are dispersed by decree of the Emperor, 462; Augustine is joined by his brother Alois in his great work, 463; they commence its publication, 464; its favourable reception by the literary world, 466; F. de Backer's laborious life, 469; his thoughtfulness for others, 470; his peaceful death, 472.

BACKER (F. Augustine de), *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus, reviewed, 452.*

Bagshawe (Right Rev. Dr.), *The Life of our Lord commemorated in the Mass, noticed, 526.*

Baluffi (Cardinal), *La Divinité de l'Eglise manifestée par sa Charité noticed, 531.*

Bilsborrow (Rev. F.), *A Course of Lectures on the Identity of the British, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Catholic Churches, noticed, 534.*

Bishop (Mrs. M. C.), *The Social Methods of Roman Catholicism in England, noticed, 533.*

CÆSARIS (C. Julii), *Commentarii de Bello Gallico, reviewed, 127.*

CARDINAL ANTONELLI, 74-84: the late Cardinal one of the most prominent characters in European diplomacy of late years, 74; though, except in his own circle, he was but little known, 74; his parentage, 75; he enters the priesthood, 76; where his talents speedily procure him notice from Gregory XVI., 76; his rapid rise, 77; he becomes Minister of Finance, 77; he resigns that office, and acts as the Holy Father's Secretary, 79; he is made Secretary of State, 80; his faithful service to the Holy Father, 81; misconception by the world in general of the relative positions of Pius IX. and the Cardinal, 82; Cardinal Antonelli was never popular, 82; he was a perfect type of the Cardinal statesman, 83; the late Cardinal Patrizi, 84.

Cartwright (Mr. W. C.), The Jesuits; their Constitution and Teaching, noticed, 542.

CIVIL INTOLERANCE OF RELIGIOUS ERROR.—PROFESSOR MIVART ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, 1-46: pain at reading Dr. Mivart's reply to our article, 1; characteristics of his paper, 1; we never doubted his loyal intentions to the Church, 2; his misapprehension of our remarks, 4; his two fundamental arguments considered, 5; on the right of the State to suppress certain crimes, 6; on the rights of the individual citizen, 7; on laws which militate against the conscience, 10; reply to Dr. Mivart's strictures on our use of the term "liberty of conscience," 13; proselytizing atheism, 15; the connection between atheism and immorality, 16; the declension of an atheist, 18; the zeal of atheism for proselytism, 20; all Christians should endeavour to check the plague, otherwise it will become unbearable, 23; the State's duty of forcibly repressing it, 25; and of preserving those rights which God has conferred upon mankind, 26; Dr. Mivart complains that our language supports antitheists, 29; a State's ethical basis, 31; the State's duty of protecting monogamistic doctrine, 33; a coercive law in some cases an evil, 34; but atheism must be exterminated, 35; Dr. Mivart's strange language towards atheists, 37; national abhorrence of Englishmen of certain tenets, 38; the Mediæval State's duty of protecting Catholicity, 39; it became at times persecution, 40; summary of our thesis, 41; criticism of three broad principles advocated by Dr. Mivart, 43; no other writer so full of loyal intentions to the Church has so violated Catholic principles, 45.

CHARACTER OF JULIUS CÆSAR (THE), 127-141: the predominance of self in the narrative of Cæsar, 127; difficulty in arriving at a true estimate of him, 128; absence of the religious element in his Commentaries, 129; his freedom as a rule from vulgar superstition, 129; although he scorned sacrificial omens he was not free from a certain amount of superstition, 130; plain statements of facts in the Commentaries, 133; his characteristics as a general, 133; his great influence over his soldiers, 134; his appreciation of his officers' services, 134; his sympathy with their involuntary errors, 135; the confidence his presence inspired in his soldiers, 136; his cruelties the result of policy, 136; he was naturally gentle and merciful, 137; his character as a writer, 138; the conciseness of his narrative, 139; his speech to the mutinous centurions, 139; our means of judging him imperfect, 140.

CLOUD IN THE EAST (THE), 181-191 : the Russian ultimatum, 181 ; the Emperor's speech at Moscow alleged to be a reply to Lord Beaconsfield's speech at Guildhall, 182 ; enthusiastic reception of the Emperor in Moscow, 182 ; the applause with which his speech was received in Russia, 183 ; preparations for war, 183 ; text of the speech, 184 ; the disregard of truth which it presents, 185 ; it was premeditated, but the effect was miscalculated, 186 ; Lord A. Loftus's despatch to Lord Derby, 187 ; the late Emperor's conversations with Sir Hamilton Seymour respecting Turkey, 188 ; his unscrupulous intentions towards that country, 189 ; irreconcilability of the late and the present Emperor's language, 189 ; the deceptions practised upon England in regard to Khiva, 190 ; mistaken opinions of English public men respecting Russia, 190 ; the straightforward policy of the Turkish government during the present crisis, 191 ; our opinion that war is inevitable, 191.

COLERIDGE'S (F.) LIFE OF OUR LIFE, 325-352 : peculiar fitness of the author of the work under review for his task, 325 ; benefits to be derived from studying the Gospels, 325 ; more particularly of the "Life of our Life," 326 ; but, unfortunately, it is not studied consecutively, 327 ; seasonableness of the present work, 328 ; it leaves but very little to be desired, 329 ; general questions connected with Gospel harmony, 330 ; F. Coleridge on the variations in the Evangelistic narratives, 332 ; suggested elucidation of one apparent discrepancy, 335 ; we cannot draw the same deduction from the silence of an inspired writer as from that of a purely human writer, 336 ; F. Coleridge on S. John's narrative of the Passion, 337 ; his theory of the construction of the Gospels, 338 ; the origin of the Gospels, 341 ; they must contain but a very small portion of the acts and words of our Lord, 342 ; F. Coleridge's division of the Gospel history, 343 ; the subdivision of our Lord's public ministry, 346 ; F. Coleridge on the evidence of the Resurrection, 349 ; and of the events of Easter Day, 350 ; concluding hope, 352,

Coleridge (Rev. F.), "The Life of our Life," *noticed*, 232 ; *reviewed*, 325.

——— Review of Montalembert's Posthumous Volume, *noticed*, 514.

CORRESPONDENCE : Professor Mivart, 557.

CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE SONNET, 141-180 : the few English Sonneteers thirty years ago, 142 ; Ebenezer Elliott's Sonnets, 143 ; specimens of Tennyson's Sonnets, 144 ; Talfourd's Sonnet to Charles Dickens, 145 ; beauty of Sir Aubrey de Vere's Sonnets, 146 ; Lord Houghton's Sonnets worthy a high place among the English Classics, 147 ; F. Faber's Sonnet to Oxford, 148 ; English poets now are mostly Sonnet writers, 149 ; Lady sonnet-writers, 150 ; Keble's Sonnet on "Prayer," 151 ; American poets rank high in this style of writing, 152 ; Sonnet by an American lady, 153 ; Catholic sonnet-writers, 153 ; Dr. Newman's Sonnets strictly Italian in style, 153 ; their originality and truth, 154 ; Mr. De Vere's Sonnets, 155 ; F. Faber's Sonnet on "The Two Faiths," 158 ; Sonnets by Gerald Griffin and by Mr. Oxenham to the Virgin, 161 ; modern Irish Sonneteers, 162 ; Mr. Earle's Sonnets, 164 ; contemporary Sonneteers, 166 ; Mr. Augustus Taylor's "Garden Sonnets," 167 ; specimens from modern English authors, 169 ; two Irish sonnet-

writers, 171 ; difficulty in English in following the Italian style, 172
 Ebenezer Elliott's remarks on the construction of the Sonnet, 174 ; his
 Model Sonnet, 175 ; Mrs. Browning's Sonnets, 178 ; two humorous
 Sonnets, 179 ; Keat's Sonnet to a Sonnet, 180.

DENNIS (Mr. J.), English Sonnets, a Selection, *reviewed*, 141.

Destombes (M. l'Abbé), *Histoire de la Persécution Religieuse en Angleterre*,
reviewed, 426.

De Vere (Sir Aubrey), Sonnets, *reviewed*, 141.

De Veyrieres (M. Louis), *Monographie des Sonnets*, *reviewed*, 141.

Dixon (Rev. F.), Dr. Sighart's Albert the Great, *noticed*, 254.

Döllinger (Dr. J.), Hippolytus and Callistus ; or, the Church of Rome in
 the First Half of the Third Century, *noticed*, 239.

Dowden (Mr. E.), Poems, *reviewed*, 141.

EARLE (Mr. J. C.), *Light leading unto Light*, *reviewed*, 141.

Elam (Dr. C.), *Winds of Doctrine*, *noticed*, 521.

Eliot (Miss G.), *Daniel Deronda*, *noticed*, 545.

ENGLISH MARTYRS, 426-451 : recent publications regarding English martyrs,
 426 ; three errors dispelled by them, 427 ; the persecution in England,
 427 ; the Franciscans and the Holy Maid of Kent, 428 ; her revelations
 respecting the King, 429 ; she is executed at Tyburn along with six
 priests, 431 ; the martyrdom of the Observants, 432 ; and of the Car-
 thusians, 433 ; heroic conduct of Mrs. Margaret Clement, 434 ; execu-
 tions of Bishop Fisher and of Sir Thomas More, 435 ; the suppression of
 the Benedictines, 436 ; the Elizabethan persecution, 437 ; the martyrs
 were not wholly of the priestly orders, but from all ranks and classes,
 437 ; the uniform illtreatment to which Catholics were subjected, 439 ;
 the gradual result of the persecution, 440 ; the martyr priests of Eliza-
 beth's and the succeeding reign, 441 ; their cruel deaths, 443 ; their
 constancy under their trials, 446 ; Archbishop Plunkett, the last
 martyr who died on the scaffold, 450 ; the debt of gratitude we Catholics
 owe to the martyrs, 451.

EXAMINATION (AN) OF MR. HERBERT SPENCER'S "PSYCHOLOGY," PART III.,
 192-219 : life and mind as correspondence, 193 ; the correspondence
 as direct and homogeneous, 194 ; the correspondence as direct but
 heterogeneous, 195 ; the correspondence as extending in space, 195 ; the
 correspondence as extending in time, 199 ; the correspondence as in-
 creasing in speciality, 201 ; the correspondence increasing in genera-
 lity, 202 ; the correspondence as increasing in complexity, 203 ; the
 co-ordination of correspondences, 205 ; the integration of correspondences,
 205 ; the correspondences in their totality, 206 ; the nature of intelli-
 gence, 209 ; the law of intelligence, 211 ; the growth of intelligence,
 213 ; reflex action, 215 ; instinct, 216 ; memory, 218.

EXAMINATION (AN) OF MR. HERBERT SPENCER'S "PSYCHOLOGY," PART IV.,
 479-502 : reason, 479 ; the feelings, 483 ; the will, 485 ; a further
 interpretation needed, 489 ; the genesis of nerves, 490 ; the genesis of
 simple nervous systems, 490 ; the genesis of compound nervous systems,

491; the genesis of doubly-compound nervous systems, 491; functions as related to these structures, 492; psychical laws as thus interpreted, 494; evidence from normal variations, 495; evidence from abnormal variations, 496; results, 496.

FREDERIC OZANAM, 304-324: effect of the Revolution of 1789 upon France in religious matters, 304; deplorable result of the teaching in the University of France, 305; among many infidels there yet remained some good Catholics, 305; the parentage and early life of Frederic Ozanam, 306; he proceeds to Paris, where he is surrounded with unbelievers, 307; with other young Catholics he endeavours to stem the tide of atheism, 308; he is made Assistant Professor at the Sorbonne, 308; his great talents, 309; his chivalrous addresses on behalf of the Church and the Christian faith, 311; he is made Professor for life, 311; his health begins to fail, 312; his indefatigable labours in the cause of religion, and his early death, 313; his affectionate remembrances of his mother, 314; the absence of fear in his composition, 315; his literary works, 316; though he called himself a republican he really was not one, 318; but a republican can still be a good Catholic, 318; De Tocqueville's remarks on Democracy, 319; Ozanam had evidently studied De Tocqueville's writings, 321; his remarks upon a country without religion, 322; his cure for the social evils of France, 323; his high estimation of the Holy Father, 324; summary of his character, 324.

GIBSON (Rev. T.) Lydiat Hall, and its Associations, *noticed*, 260.

Glött (Rev. F.) Why are we Roman Catholics? *noticed*, 526.

Grimm (Dr. J.), History of the Childhood of Jesus, *noticed*, 549.

Guépin (Rev. Dom Alphonse), Saint Josaphat, Archevêque de Polock, Martyr de l'Unité Catholique, *reviewed*, 46.

HAMMOND (Dr. W. A.), Spiritualism and allied Causes and Conditions of Nervous Derangement, *noticed*, 263.

Houghton (Lord), The Poetical Works of John Keats, *reviewed*, 141.

Humphrey (Rev. W.), The Panegyrics of Father Segneri, *noticed*, 524.

Hunter (Rev. F.), An English Carmelite, *noticed*, 530.

Hutton (Mr. T. H.), Essays, Theological and Literary, *noticed*, 240.

JESUITS IN CONFLICT, *reviewed*, 426.

KAVANAGH (Very Rev. Dr.), Solar Physics, *noticed*, 554.

LAW (Rev. F. T. G.), A Calendar of the English Martyrs, *reviewed*, 426.

Livre (de) des Sonnets, *reviewed*, 141.

Long, (Mr. George), C. Julii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico *reviewed*, 127.

Lubbock (Sir John, Bart.), Prehistoric Times, *reviewed*, 352.

— The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man *reviewed*, 352.

yell (Sir Charles, Bart., M.A.), *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*, *reviewed*, 352.

MANNING (Cardinal), *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, *noticed*, 508.

Merivale (Dr. C.), *History of the Romans under the Empire*, *reviewed*, 127

Mivart (Mr. St. George), *Liberty of Conscience*, *reviewed*, 1.

Morris (Rev. F.), *A Sermon preached at S. Beuno's College*, *noticed*, 533.

— *The Condition of Catholics under James I.*, *reviewed*, 426.

— *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, *reviewed*, 426, *noticed*, 511.

Murray (Mr. J. O'Kane), *A Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, *noticed*, 246.

Murray (Dr. P.), *Tractatus de Gratiâ*, *noticed*, 229.

NAPOLÉON III., *History of Julius Cæsar*, *reviewed*, 127.

"New Republic" (The), or, *Culture, Faith, and Philosophy in an English Country House*, *noticed*, 518.

New Testament Vulgate (The), in the Words of the Sacred Writers, *reviewed*, 325.

Neumayr (Rev. F.), *The Science of the Spiritual Life*, *noticed*, 268.

Nord (Le), 19 Novembre, 1876, *reviewed*, 181.

O'MEARA (Miss Kathleen), *Frederic Ozanam, his Life and Works*, *noticed*, 249; *reviewed*, 304.

PAST AND PRESENT OF FRANCE (THE), 111-127 : the present state of France unparalleled, 111; repudiation by modern Frenchmen of all their ancient traditions, 112; the civil divisions and want of unity among them, 112; what are we to understand by the word "Revolution?" 113; retrospective view, 114; the condition of the peasantry in 1787, 114; the oppressive taxes which were levied on the small cultivators, 115; change created in France by the Revolution of 1789, 115; causes which led up to that event, 117; the attacks upon the liberties of the cities, 117; the National Assembly in 1790 embodied in their new system the most important of the old institutions, 118; whichever party has been in power since has employed the same agents as its predecessors, 118; the incessant plotting of the different political parties, 119; the policy of M. Gambetta, 120; his attack upon the Church, 120; Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia on the heroism of the French priests, 121; the suicidal policy of the Radicals, 121; the increase of Catholicism in France, 122; danger to the Republicans from universal suffrage, 123; change in the character of the Councils-General, 124; difficulty in forming a ministry, and in its retaining power, 125; what next?, 126; we think the result will be Conservatism, 127.

Payne (Mr. J.), *Songs of Life and Death*, *reviewed*, 141.

PIUS IX. ON LIBERAL CATHOLICISM, 507.

Potthast (Von August), *Bibliotheca Historica Medii Ævi*, *reviewed*, 377.

PRIMITIVE MAN IN THE SOMME VALLEY, 352-377; difference of opinion among scientific men respecting the antiquity of man, 352; result of modern discoveries upon the question, 353; Mr. Southall's work on the "Origin of Man," 354; summary and analysis of previous evidence on the antiquity of man, 354; though not a Catholic, Mr. Southall is a believer in revelation, 355; the chronology of the Septuagint, 356; the remains of Primitive Man in Western Europe, 358; the Stone and the Bronze Ages, 358; the discoveries in the Somme Valley, 359; the changes produced by a river in the physical appearance of a country, 360; arguments for a great antiquity of man founded on the changes caused by the Somme, 361; proofs of the fallacy of many of those arguments, 362; M. Boucher de Perthes' theory of the peat controverted by himself, 363; Mr. Alfred Tylor on the gravel deposit, 365; his theory supported by Mr. Prestwich, 366; results of a flood in India, 366; imaginary sketch of the manners of the early inhabitants of Europe, 367; man a contemporary of the mammoth, 370; evidence of the recent existence of the gigantic mammalia, 371; a new argument on the recent origin of man, 372; opinions of modern geologists, 373; Professor Tait contends that life has not been possible on the earth for more than fifteen million years, 374; probability that the Biblical account is, in the main, correct, 375; degeneracy of many of the ancient nations in mechanical matters, 376; all modern discoveries tend to disprove the Darwinian theory, 376.

Protocol relative to the Affairs of Turkey, *reviewed*, 473.

Pusey (Dr. E. B.) on the Clause "and the Son," in regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conferences, *noticed*, 244.

RASSMAN (Von F.), Sonette der Deutschen, *reviewed*, 141.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, *reviewed*, 426.

Remarks on a late Assailant of the Society of Jesus, *noticed*, 542.

Rivieres (Rev. F.), Questions Egypto-Bibliques, *noticed*, 256.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS, 275.

ROMAN HISTORY A FOREMOST BULWARK OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD AGAINST THE ANTICHRIST OF OUR TIMES, 85-111: folly of indulging in illusions that the growth of the anti-Christian power of our day is to be treated as a matter of indifference, 85; the impossibility of peace between the cause of faith and the infidel faction, 88; both claim powers to teach and to form men to their own entirely opposite models, 89; Roman history certain to become a subject of contention between the two, 90; the question of how the Christian side is armed in the matter of a Roman history manual, 93; the Christian mode of teaching Roman history, 96; the contrary ideas of the Middle Ages, 99; Dante's ideas are conformable with the dictates of the common sense of men, 100; Rome the chosen instrument of the government of God over the nations, to procure for them a centre of unity, 103; why the above mission by itself would be incomplete, 107; various kinds of evidence available for the purpose of proof, 110.

Rowe (Rev. J. B.), Elementary Education and the Catholic Poor-School Committee, *noticed*, 250.

RUSSIA, 277-303 : the light recently thrown upon semi-barbarous nations, 277 ; the farce of establishing schools in Russia, 277 ; the union of hypocrisy with religion in that country, 278 ; it has been one of the chief causes of unbelief, 278 ; the accounts foreigners have published of the inner life of Russia, 279 ; the restrictions upon freedom of speech, 280 ; the spread of atheism among the Greeks, 281 ; the foundation of the Russian empire under Peter I., 282 ; he created himself Patriarch of the Greek Church, 283 ; which title has been assumed by all his successors, 284 ; the temporal character of the Greek Church, 285 ; cruel persecution of Roman Catholics, 286 ; liberty of conscience promised to the Catholics of Poland on the partition of that country, 287 ; but the promise was broken immediately after, 288 ; the Greek Church owes its origin to the Holy See, 289 ; combination of superstition with immorality among modern Russians, 290 ; the secular character of the present Greek Church, 291 ; the grossly immoral life of the clergy, 292 ; Mr. Grant Duff on the intolerance of the Greek Church, 293 ; persecution only increases the number of Nonconformists, 293 ; the increase of drunkenness in Russia, 295 ; the priests as a rule encourage it, 296 ; their mendacity, 297 ; the people do not respect them, 298 ; their condonation of heresy, 300 ; ignorance of religious subjects of the peasantry, 301 ; gravity of the political situation, 302 ; the supremacy of a lay Church fatal to religious freedom, 303.

SAINT JOSAPHAT, MARTYR OF CATHOLIC UNITY, 46-74 : transient moral effect of the actions of the mightiest hero that ever lived, 46 ; even the Rome of the Cæsars is only great as being the Rome of the Popes, 47 ; different results from the labours of the servants of the Church, 48 ; lesson to be learned from the story of S. Josaphat, 48 ; the early intimate relations between the Roman and Greek Churches, 50 ; the ultimate abject servility of the Greek schism to the State, 50 ; the mission of Cyril and Methodius among the Slavonians, 51 ; the low state of spiritual life in Russia in the sixteenth century, 51 ; early life of S. Josaphat, 52 ; he becomes a monk of the order of S. Basil, 53 ; the austerity of his life, 55 ; his labours in the cause of unity, 55 ; marks of divine favour shown to him, 56 ; the contrast in all ages between the defenders of the Church and their adversaries, 57 ; the contest between S. Josaphat and Maximus Smotrycki, 58 ; he visits the Monastery of the Crypts, 60 ; where he is threatened with death, but refutes his enemies in argument, 61 ; his success in converting the schismatics, 61 ; he is consecrated Archbishop of Polack, 63 ; his humility, 64 ; he is persecuted as the Apostle of Unity, 65 ; but converts many of his persecutors, 67 ; he is martyred by the Russians, 69 ; prodigies which accompanied his martyrdom, 70 ; miracles which followed his death, 71 ; his life a lesson for all time, 72 ; the Poles petition Pius IX. to canonize him, 73 ; concluding hope for Unity, 74.

Saint Jure (Rev. F.), Union with our Lord Jesus Christ in his principal Mysteries, *noticed*, 535.

Saint Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, *noticed*, 536.

Scheme for Providing Pensions for Catholic Schoolmasters, *noticed*, 538.

Southall (Mr. J. C.), The Recent Origin of Man, as illustrated by Geology and the Modern Science of Prehistoric Archaeology, *reviewed*, 352.

Stephen (Mr. Leslie), History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, *noticed*, 550.

STUDY (THE) OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY, 377-425: our religious and political creeds the result of tradition, 377; effect of tradition upon history, 378; the deplorable result upon the treasures of medieval art by would-be improvers, 379; Goethe did much to counteract the false ideas prevalent in his time, 380; in our country Scott and Wordsworth followed in his steps, 381; the Oxford movement also exercised considerable influence, 382; Mr. Kenelm Digby's "Mores Catholici," 383; modern English writers on medieval history, 384; the superficial character in general of their writings, 385; Mr. Bryce's misconception of the nature of the German Empire, 386; Mr. Freeman's animosity to the Holy See, 387; the great value of the publications of the Early English Text Society, 388; the Oxford movement the advent in England simultaneously with the Continent of the refutation of the false ideas prevalent respecting medieval life in Italy, 389; French and German writers on medieval history, 390; to name all would be impossible in our limits, 391; an improved opinion of the medieval ages growing rapidly, 393; though its study has brought some to the true fold, the wish expressed that a Catholic writer will yet arise, 394; it is our only hope for an impartial treatment of the subject, 395; the tone of mind in which the subject should be approached, 396; evil of generalizing from particular customs, 397; the Middle Ages were divided into epochs, 399; their chequered character, 400; the destruction of religious unity, 401; the influence of religion upon the ancient communities, 402; one result of the Reformation was a partial return to atheism, 403; beautiful idea of the mission of the Catholic Church, 404; the position of the Pope in the Middle Ages, 406; his temporal power was almost as great as his spiritual, 409; his influence was always exercised in behalf of peace, 410; he was the promoter of guilds and free associations, 412; the constitution of society in the Middle Ages, 414; the spontaneous loyalty of that time, 415; on the intolerance of the Middle Ages, 416; if intolerance in religious matters prevailed, it was only a consequence of the universal prevalence of faith, 418; the mingled devotion and grossness of the manner of living, 420; difference between the Middle Ages and our own time, 422; a study of Church History particularly valuable at the present time, 425.

Sweeney (Very Rev. Dr. J.N.), Switzerland in 1876, *noticed*, 515.

TIMES (The), 7th Nov. and 7th Dec., 1876, *reviewed*, 74; 22nd Jan., 1877, *reviewed*, 181.

Tocqueville (A. de), De l'Ancien Regime et de la Révolution, *reviewed*, 111.

Todhunter (Mr. J.), *Laurella*, and other Poems, *reviewed*, 141.

Tomlinson (Mr. C., F.R.S.), *The Sonnet ; its Origin, Structure, and Place in Poetry*, *reviewed*, 141.

Tricht (Rev. P. Van), *La Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus et le P. de Backer*, *reviewed*, 452.

Trollope (Mr. T. A.), *The Papal Conclaves, as they were and as they are*, *noticed*, 539.

—*The Commentaries of Cæsar*, *reviewed*, 127.

UNIVERS, Dec. 9, 1876, *reviewed*, 74.

WALLACE (Mr. D. Mackenzie), *Russia*, *reviewed*, 277.

WAR (THE), 473-478 : our anticipation of the war, 473 ; the interests of the European Powers involved in the conflict, 473 ; public opinion in England, 474 ; degeneracy of English statesmanship, 474 ; Russian conspiracies in Bulgaria, 475 ; prospect of a long and general war, 476 ; Russia unable to put forth all her strength against Turkey, 477 ; the armed strength of Europe, 477 ; possible danger to England, 478 ; the Papal Allocution, 478.

ERRATUM.—*In the January Number, p. 166, lines 11 and 12,*

For—In sacrifice we hail the dawning light,
Through one alone is virtue clothed with right,

Read—In Lucifer we hail the dawning light,
Through vice alone is virtue clothed with might.

